

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, JANUARY 29, 1887.

CONTENTS.

CURRENT TOPICS	251
THE BENCH AND THE BAR	253
THE ATTORNEYMENT CLAUSE	254
REGISTRATION OF TRADE-MARKS IN COLOUR	254
REVIEWS	255
CASES OF THE WEEK:—	
<i>Ex parte</i> Nowitt	256
<i>Ex parte</i> Hall	257
<i>In re</i> Dale	257
<i>Bostock v. Pearson</i>	257
<i>The London and Suburban Land and Building Company v. Field</i>	257
<i>Dawkins v. Ambrosus</i>	257
<i>Pascoe v. Richards</i>	258
<i>Re</i> Rees, <i>Rees v. George</i>	258
<i>Mudge v. Adams</i>	258
CASES BEFORE THE BANKRUPTCY REGISTRARS:—	
<i>Ex parte</i> Foreman and another, <i>Re</i> Roberts	259
OBITUARY	260
SOCIETIES	260
LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL	261
LEGAL APPOINTMENTS	263
COMPANIES	263
THE COUNCIL OF JUDGES	263
CREDITORS' CLAIMS	265
LEGISLATION OF THE WEEK	266
LONDON GAZETTE, &c., &c.	266

CASES REPORTED IN THE WEEKLY REPORTER.

<i>Allen v. Garbutt</i> (Q.B.Div.)	257
<i>Association of Land Financiers (Limited), In re</i> (Ch.Div. V.C.M.)	277
<i>Badcock, In re. Kingdon v. Tagert</i> (Ch.Div.V.C.M.)	278
<i>Barker's Estate, In re. Hetherington v. Longrigg</i> (Ch.Div. V.C.H.)	281
<i>Bartlett, In re. Newman v. Hook</i> (Ch.Div.V.C.M.)	279
<i>Benbow v. Low</i> (App.)	295
<i>Berwick, Ex parte. In re Young</i> (Bkey.)	292
<i>Bond, Ex parte. In re Bond</i> (Bkey.)	292
<i>Greener, Ex parte. In re Greener</i> (App.)	295
<i>Hamlyn v. Betteley</i> (App.)	275
<i>Matthews v. Jeffery</i> (Ch.Div. Fry, J.)	282
<i>Paul v. Paul</i> (Ch.Div. V.C.M.)	281
<i>Queen, The, v. Gaunt</i> (Q.B.Div.)	280
<i>Queen, The, v. Ingall</i> (Q.B.Div.)	288
<i>Robinson v. Currey</i> (Q.B.Div.)	284
<i>Sanders v. Scarsion. Sanders v. Smith</i> (C.P.Div.)	289
<i>Stewart, In re. Stewart v. Stewart</i> (Ch.Div.M.R.)	275
<i>Wilson v. Lord Bury</i> (App.)	269
<i>Wreck Recovery and Salvage Company, In re</i> (App.)	296

CURRENT TOPICS.

IT HAS BEEN STATED in some provincial journals that Mr. W. F. ROBINSON, Q.C., will succeed the late Mr. LITTLE, Q.C., as Vice-Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster. We have reason to believe that Mr. ROBINSON is not a candidate for the vacant post.

THE TRANSFER of fifty causes from the list of the Master of the Rolls to Mr. Justice FRY, for the purpose of hearing only; and of thirty causes from the list of Vice-Chancellor HALL, and twenty causes from the list of Vice-Chancellor MALINS, to Vice-Chancellor BACON, will be published at the close of the present week.

IT IS UNDERSTOOD that some dissatisfaction is felt by the chief clerks at the limited extent of the accommodation proposed to be afforded them in the Royal Courts of Justice. Considering that the chambers of each of

these officers comprise what may fairly be described as the whole machinery of a court, sitting daily from eleven till four, it is essential to the convenience of practitioners that abundant accommodation should be provided. Since the plans of the new building were made, the staff of each chief clerk has been increased, and it is to be feared that the probability of such increase was not kept in mind at the time the building was planned.

THE BOARD OF INLAND REVENUE has altered the regulations as to the claims for the allowance of spoiled and useless stamps. Applications for the allowance of spoiled stamps may now be made by the owner of the stamps, or a clerk or agent nominated for that purpose by him, on every day, except Saturday, up to three, and on Saturday up to one, at Somerset House, and at Winchester-buildings on every day in the week, except Saturday, from eleven to three. The Board of Inland Revenue state that arrangements will shortly be made for further facilitating the allowance of spoiled stamps and expediting the issue of stamps in lieu of the same. These concessions (says a correspondent) are the result of suggestions submitted to Mr. Gladstone as to the unfair way in which the former regulations worked, and will cause general satisfaction, it having been the practice of many persons to waive small claims rather than take the trouble or incur the expense of making an application for allowance.

MR. GLADSTONE'S resolution for dealing with obstruction appears to be, to some extent, based on the practice of the German Reichstag. In that assembly (as we learn from the recent Parliamentary Blue-book), a proposal for *clôture* has to be submitted to the President by a motion in writing, and must be supported by thirty members. The President then, without further discussion, takes a vote by show of hands. If the votes are even or doubtful, the debate proceeds, but the motion for the *clôture* can be repeated at any time.

THE PRACTICE in other Assemblies is more summary. Thus in the Austrian Reichsrath, a motion to close the debate may be put at any time, and may be carried by a simple majority, but a speech in course of delivery may not be interrupted, and, after the resolution has been carried, one member may be heard on each side, and the debate is considered to be re-opened if a member of the Government afterwards rises. In the Italian Parliament, the *clôture* can be demanded at any time by one or more members. Only one member can speak against it, and if it is carried the debate ceases, except in the case of a personal explanation. In the United States' House of Representatives, the passing of a motion for the previous question terminates all debate, and brings the House to a direct vote upon the question before it.

THE COURT OF APPEAL have raised a point which is worthy of attention. Under ord. 34, r. 1, a special case in an action may be stated for the opinion of the court, and, when the special case comes on to be heard, the court gives its opinion on the questions laid before it. In the majority of cases the decision on the special case disposes of the whole of the action, but this fact has

been lost sight of, and although the decision is really a final judgment, and allows the parties twelve months for appeal, the order on a special case has hitherto been drawn up in like manner as orders on special cases under 13 & 14 Vict. c. 35, were drawn up. On the face of it the order has, therefore, appeared to be an interlocutory order only, allowing the shorter time for appealing. This would appear to have come to the attention of the Appeal Court in a case of *Williams v. Williams*, which was not reported on the point referred to. Vice-Chancellor HALL has done his best to set matters right in *Harrison v. The Cornwall Minerals Railway Company* (29 W. R. 258), and the Master of the Rolls in a more recent case, not yet reported, has also called attention to the matter. In future, when a special case involves the decision of the whole action, it is to be set down in the cause books together with a motion for judgment, and counsel will move for judgment accordingly, after the court has given its opinion, and this will appear upon the judgment as drawn up.

LORD JUSTICE BRAMWELL's letter on Mr. Justice STEPHEN's recent article comes very opportunely, and might have been still more useful if it had arrived before the recent bar meeting. The opinion of the most experienced judge on the bench in favour of the single-judge system, and his ridicule of Mr. Justice STEPHEN's apprehension of the existence of a class of parliamentary lawyers who won't take what Mr. Justice WATKIN WILLIAMS would call an "ordinary judgeship," ought to have weight with Parliament upon the debate on the Order in Council. It is not true, the Lord Justice declares, "that we should not get such men as Mr. Justice STEPHEN mentions to be judges. When they found they could neither be Chancellor nor Chief Justice, and were not made Lords of Appeal nor Lords Justices, 'because the public interest did not require men of that class to be placed there,' they would quietly take their seats as puisne judges after they had saved a good sum of money by their large practice." We may add, in confirmation of this, that LORD CAMPBELL states that, when Attorney-General, he requested that a puisne judgeship, which was then vacant, might not be filled up until he had had an opportunity of considering whether he would accept the post or not. He appears, however, to have withdrawn his application at the urgent request of LORD MELBOURNE and LORD JOHN RUSSELL.

THE DATE of coming into operation of the Order in Council respecting the abolition of the offices of Chief Justice of the Common Pleas and Chief Baron of the Exchequer, and the consolidation of the common law divisions of the High Court, which was laid on the table of both Houses on the 4th of January last, has been the subject of some controversy. The matter is regulated by section 32 of the Judicature Act, 1873, which provides that "no such order . . . shall come into operation until the same shall have been laid before each House of Parliament for thirty days on which that House shall have sat, &c." The question to be solved is, how are we to count the days of sitting of the House? Is there a fiction which allows every day succeeding the meeting of Parliament, including Sundays, and those days, such as Saturdays, over which an adjournment ordinarily takes place, to be counted; or are we to count only the five days a week on which there is business transacted? Unless an address is presented to her Majesty, the Order in Council would, in the former case, come into operation on Friday, the 4th of February, and in the latter case, not before the 16th. This, of course, only applies to the House of Commons; when the House of Lords will have sat thirty days it is not yet possible to anticipate. The language of the section is not quite clear, but we

think there can be little doubt that only days on which the House has ordinarily sat should be counted.

WE LATELY NOTICED that there had been a tendency on the part of workmen and employers to contract themselves out of the provisions of the Employers' Liability Act of last year. Two measures have been already introduced into the House of Commons with a view of preventing any such contracts. The Employers' Liability Bill, which has been introduced by Messrs. MACLIVER and MORLEY, recites that "attempts have been made to impose on workmen contracts exonerating employers from their liability, . . . and it is unjust to workmen, and inexpedient in the interests of public safety, that the operations of the Employers' Liability Act be thus defeated"; and section 1 enacts that "if and so far as any contract purports to derogate from the liability defined or declared by the Employers' Liability Act, 1880, that contract shall be void." The Employers' Liability Act Amendment Bill of Messrs. MACDONALD, BURT, and BROADHURST is not quite such a sweeping measure. Section 1 enacts that all the provisions of the Act of last year "shall have effect and be enforced by every court in every case, notwithstanding any contract or agreement excluding all or any of the provisions of the said Act, or otherwise interfering with the operation thereof"; but it is provided "(1) that this Act shall not affect any contract or agreement made before the passing of this Act; and (2) that, in determining in any case the amount of compensation payable under the said Act by an employer, the court shall take into consideration the value of any payment or contribution made by such employer to any insurance fund or compensation fund, to the extent to which any person who would otherwise be entitled to compensation under the said Act has actually received compensation out of such payment or contribution at the expense of such employer."

THE PROVISIONS of Mr. FORSTER's Bill for the Better Protection of Person and Property in Ireland are not quite identical with those which were contained in the *Habeas Corpus Suspension (Ireland) Act, 1866*. The 1st section authorizes the arrest and legal detention during the continuance of the Act, "without bail or mainprize," of any person declared by warrant of the Lord-Lieutenant to be reasonably suspected of having been either before or after the passing of the Act guilty of high treason, treason felony, or treasonable practices, wherever committed, or of any crime punishable by law committed in a prescribed district, "being an act of violence or intimidation," or the inciting to an act of violence or intimidation, and "tending to interfere with or disturb the maintenance of law and order." Such person is not to be discharged or tried without the Lord-Lieutenant's warrant, which is to be conclusive evidence of all matters contained therein, of the jurisdiction to issue and execute the warrant, and of the legality of the arrest and detention. The Act of 1866 authorized the detention in safe custody without bail till the ensuing 1st of September of all persons in prison at the time of the passing of the Act for high treason, treason felony, or treasonable practices under a warrant signed by six members of the Irish Privy Council, or by the Lord-Lieutenant, or the Chief Secretary for Ireland, such persons not to be bailed or tried till the said 1st of September. By the present Bill every person detained is to be treated as an accused person, and not as a convicted prisoner; and a list of persons detained in prison under the Act, with a statement of the place of detention, and the ground stated for the arrest of each person, is to be laid before each House of Parliament within the first seven days of each month during which Parliament is sitting. There was no provision corresponding to this in the Act of 1866, but a similar enactment was made by the Westmeath Act, 1871 (34 & 35 Vict. c. 25), s. 9. "Prescribed district" is to mean any part of Ireland

specified by an order of the Lord-Lieutenant for the time being in force. Such orders may be made, revoked, or varied by the Lord-Lieutenant by or with the advice of the Privy Council. By section 2 a warrant or order of the Lord-Lieutenant may be signified either under his hand or under the hand of the Chief Secretary, and a copy of every warrant is within seven days to be transmitted (as was also provided under the Act of 1866), to the Clerk of the Crown for the city of Dublin, to be by him filed in his public office. The Lord-Lieutenant is empowered, by and with the advice of the Privy Council, to make, revoke, or alter any order prescribing the form of a warrant, all such orders to be published in the *Dublin Gazette*, a printed copy of which is to be conclusive evidence of the date and contents of the order, and that it was duly made. By section 3 the Act is to remain in force till the 30th of September, 1882, while the Act of 1866 was only in force from February till September of that year.

THE CONCURRENCE, in the same number of the *London Gazette*, of the names of an English and a Scotch peer will draw attention to the Bankruptcy Disqualification Act, 1871 (34 & 35 Vict. c. 50), which enacts that every peer who becomes a bankrupt shall be disqualified from sitting or voting in the House of Lords, or in any committee thereof, and if a peer of Scotland or Ireland, shall be disqualified from being elected to sit and vote in the House of Lords; but a bankrupt peer recovers his rights of sitting and voting upon the determination of his bankruptcy. It will be remembered that by the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, any member of Parliament adjudicated a bankrupt is suspended for a year from the right of sitting or voting in the House of Commons, unless within that time the order is annulled or the creditors proving debts are fully paid or satisfied, and by section 122, in default of such annulment, payment, or satisfaction, the member's seat is to be vacant at the end of the year.

MR. ASTON, Q.C., writing to a daily contemporary, suggests that the Temple Bar Memorial, when removed from its present position, should be replaced by a subway for the purpose of enabling foot-passengers to cross with safety from the Royal Courts of Justice to the other side of the Strand; and another correspondent states that the subway was part of the original plan which the architects of the building were instructed to provide for. There can be no doubt that the subway or bridge was part of Mr. STREET's original plan, made in pursuance of the printed instructions to competing architects to which we referred some months since. The want of the subway is due, not to Mr. STREET, but to the modifications introduced by Mr. AYTON, when, as Chief Commissioner of Works, he applied his ingenuity to reducing the cost of the New Law Courts.

THE ANNUAL EXPENDITURE for wages of servants and guardians of the Royal Courts of Justice after that building becomes fully occupied has been officially estimated at £10,000.

Lord Shand, says the *Scotsman*, having been named a member of the Committee of Judges and others appointed to advise the Lord Chancellor in reference to proposed improvements in the practice and procedure of law courts in England, attended a meeting of the committee in London on Tuesday. We learn, on excellent authority, that the information which Lord Shand communicated to the judges as to Scotch procedure was greatly appreciated.

THE BENCH AND THE BAR.

THE bench lately, by a considerable majority (as will be seen from the minutes of the Council of Judges, which we print elsewhere), assented to the Lord Chancellor's proposal for the abolition of the two vacant chiefships; the bar has now, by an inconsiderable majority, expressed in the meeting lately held in the Middle Temple Hall, dissented from that view. It ought, however, to be remembered, to the honour of the profession, that those members of it who might reasonably expect to succeed, if anyone succeeded, to the vacant posts, did not cast their opinion and influence on the side of their interests—indeed, the expression of opinion may be fairly called a disinterested one, and seems to find its source wholly in sentiment. This may account for the fact that the speakers in favour of the extinction of these ancient offices seem not, as a rule, to have been those who are most concerned with current business; and that the eminent gentleman who led the opposition to the proposed change is one who has for many years sought fame rather as a scholar and an author than in the courts of justice. It is, indeed, hardly credible that those who are sufferers by the disorder and confusion that now reign among the relics of a system which is in the course of vital change, should wish to perpetuate those varieties in the administration of justice which are the cause of their miseries. Yet we seem almost driven to the belief that men who are acquainted with the legislation of the last thirty years fancy it yet possible to restore the past as it once existed, and to start the legal coach along the old road, just as if nothing had happened. It is true that the bar, as a body, have not taken much part in bringing about these changes. Bodies of men, however trained and educated, rarely do so. But then it is surely rather late to begin to interfere; and it is unfortunate to take an opportunity of doing so which seems to afford no other motive for speech than the fact that they have been silent so long, and that as there is nothing else just now to say, they must say just that or nothing.

There is indeed something strange, and almost weird, in the interest which thus gathers the bar to their ancient hall to defend these superannuated offices. It recalls the silent mariners in the enchanted ship, which has been moving on, rather from some unknown impulse than under any guiding hand:—

The loud wind never reached the ship,
Yet now the ship moved on!
Beneath the lightning and the moon
The dead men gave a groan.
They groaned, they stirred, they all awoke—

but only the first half of the next line is true—

Nor spoke, nor moved their eyes.

Yet let us hope that they will after a time "move their eyes" enough to see how much it will conduce to the real dignity and power of the administration of justice to dispense with these useless and now meaningless titles rather than offices; and will throw their energies into the attempt to assist in forcing the chariot of law out of the ruts where it now drags its wheels. If they will do this, we do not despair of seeing once again an united bench and bar under the control of a powerful chief, and some of that true dignity restored which idle attempts to withstand "manifest destiny," and to cling to the old remnants and patches of the past, can only diminish and impair.

The Chicago Bar Association have had a dinner, says the *Albany Law Journal*, and a question arose as to the meaning of a verse in the programme said to be in Latin, and after an animated discussion no two could agree as to its meaning, and no one could be found who could give a correct translation of it.

THE ATTORNMENT CLAUSE.

We suppose we must consider the judgment of the Court of Appeal in the recent case of *Ex parte Jackson*, *In re Bowes* (29 W. R. 253), as a final explanation of one main test to be applied to ascertain the validity of an attornment clause in a mortgage. As our readers will remember, we have often drawn attention to the vacillations of judicial opinion on this subject. In *In re Williams* (26 W. R. 274) Lord Justice James rested his decision that the attornment clause was invalid on the ground that looking at the whole scope of the deed, and the intention of the parties, it was a mere contrivance to give the mortgagee an additional benefit in case of the mortgagor's bankruptcy. But Lord Justice Thesiger laid it down that section 34 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, is intended only to protect a *bond fide* rent, and not a rent which does not in any way represent the real letting value of the premises. In *In re Stockton Iron Furnace Company* (27 W. R. 433), Lord Justice Bramwell said that the intention and object of the arrangement in *In re Williams* was to commit a fraud on the bankruptcy law, since practically the effect of the provisions of the mortgage in that case was that the attornment clause should come into operation only in the event of bankruptcy. That is to say, he adopted the view of Lord Justice James in the earlier case. But the latter Lord Justice pronounced the view (in which he was supported by the Master of the Rolls) that the reservation in the attornment clause of a rent very much above the value of the property might show that the attornment clause was a device to enable the mortgagee to obtain, in the event of the mortgagor's bankruptcy, something which he would not otherwise obtain. In *Ex parte The Bank of Whitehaven*, *In re Bowes* (28 W. R. 523), Bacon, C.J., refused to admit the excessive amount of rent reserved as a test of whether an attornment clause was a fraud on the bankruptcy law. He thought that no such proposition could be drawn from the earlier decisions. When the case came before the Court of Appeal, however (*sub. nom. Ex parte Jackson*), the court (Baggallay, Cotton, and Thesiger, L.JJ.) held, unequivocally, that the validity of an attornment clause in a mortgage depends on whether the tenancy created, and the rent reserved, are a real tenancy and a real rent; and that the proportion the rent reserved bears to the true lettable value of the property is the chief test of the reality of the rent.

The process by which this conclusion is reached is something like this:—there is clearly a right, as between mortgagor and mortgagee, where the former is in possession of the mortgaged property, to insert in the mortgage deed an attornment by the mortgagor to the mortgagee. The object of this clause is to give the mortgagee an equivalent for the benefit which he would have derived from the rent if a third person had been in possession of the mortgaged property. In the latter case the mortgagee could at any time have demanded payment of the rent in arrear. He could have applied the rent which might be paid to him under such demand in discharge, or part discharge, of the interest in arrear on his mortgage, and if it was more than sufficient for the discharge of the interest due, it could be applied in discharge or satisfaction, *pro tanto*, of the principal debt itself. The equivalent for this is an attornment at what the court call "a real rent"—i.e., a rent corresponding to the true lettable value of the property. If the property is in possession of the mortgagor, the mortgagee may turn him out and let it to a stranger, and, therefore, there is nothing unreasonable, nothing that can be called a fraud on the law of bankruptcy, in allowing the parties to make a contract in the mortgage deed which they might afterwards validly and effectually make. An attornment at a sum called rent, but which is infinitely in excess of any rent which any tenant would give for the premises, is far more than an equivalent for the benefit of the tenancy

of a third person. "In this case," said Lord Justice Thesiger, "the rent is not a real rent but a mere sham; the tenancy is not a real tenancy but a mere sham; and the attornment clause is a mere device to give the mortgagee a hold, in the event of bankruptcy, over the goods and chattels of the mortgagor which would otherwise have been distributed amongst the general creditors, and the attornment clause is invalid and inoperative because it is a fraud upon the bankruptcy law."

In another recent case of *Ex parte Punnett*, *In re Kitchen* (29 W. R. 129), a curious question was raised as to the attornment clause. The first mortgagee of a leasehold public-house took an attornment as tenant from the mortgagor to secure the interest on his mortgage; the second mortgagee did the same, and it appeared on the face of the second mortgage that the first mortgage was still outstanding and undischarged. The question was whether, under those circumstances, the second mortgagee had a right to distrain after the liquidation of the mortgagor for rent accrued under his attornment before the liquidation. The court held that he had. "If," said the Master of the Rolls, "by a condition, notwithstanding the facts are known that the legal estate is outstanding in a mortgagee, and that the mortgagor is not really the owner of the reversion, you can create a tenancy by what may be called *estoppel*, or *quasi-estoppel* (it does not matter what term we use), it appears to me there is nothing, either in law or in good sense, to prevent the same arrangement being made with more than one mortgagee."

REGISTRATION OF TRADE-MARKS IN COLOUR.

I.

On more than one occasion we have briefly called attention to the subject of colour in connection with the registration of trade-marks, but the recent case of *In re Robinson* (29 W. R. 31) throws so much additional light upon the matter that we take this opportunity of recurring to it and dealing with it in greater detail.

It is well known that the Trade-Marks Registration Act of 1875, by which the registration of trade-marks in the United Kingdom is regulated, contains no allusion to the question of colour, but that question was tacitly reserved for the consideration of the Lord Chancellor and his advisers when the rules under the Act should have to be framed. In those rules, when they were prepared and made public, no express mention of colour was made, but the silence of the rules was easily interpreted to mean that colour was to be eliminated. Among other provisions contained in the rules, the 8th rule requires an applicant for registration to supply the registrar with a description of his trade-mark in writing, accompanied, when practicable, by a representation of the trade-mark in duplicate. By the 13th rule the registrar is to require the applicant to insert an advertisement of the application in the official paper (now published under the title of the *Trade-Marks Journal*), and by the 15th rule the applicant may, for the purposes of such advertisement, be required to furnish the printer of the journal with a wood-block or electrotype of the trade-mark, or with such other information or means of advertising the trade-mark as the registrar may allow. It is also material to notice that by another part of the 8th rule the registrar may, in exceptional cases, deposit in the Patent Museum a specimen or copy of a trade-mark which cannot conveniently be placed on his register, and may refer thereto in his register in such manner as he thinks advisable. With respect to deposited marks, it is apparent that they will be seen by those who inspect them in the same colours and arrangement as they present in actual use.

With respect to cotton goods, a special set of rules,

numbered from 57 to 63, was made, which appeared in the new edition of the rules issued in 1876, having been drawn up subsequently to the original framing of the rules in 1875. By the 57th rule, an office is to be established at Manchester for the exhibition of all trade-marks used in the cotton trade. By the 58th rule, as amended by the rule of December 1, 1876, every proprietor of an old cotton mark is required to send to the Manchester office three representations of such cotton mark, in such form and with such a description as may be from time to time required by the Commissioners of Patents. By the 60th rule, the Committee of Experts at Manchester, appointed under rule 59, are to form a list of the cotton marks sent to the Manchester office in two classes (the first class consisting of such cotton marks as they consider to be trade-marks within the Act, and the second class consisting of such cotton marks as they consider not to be trade-marks within the meaning of the Act), and to transmit such list to the Commissioners of Patents, accompanied by two representations of each of the marks specified in the second class in such list. The third representation of each of the marks in the second class is to be retained for reference in the Manchester office. By rule 62, proprietors of marks not placed in the second class may apply for registration in the ordinary way. By the additional rules of February 26, 1877, rules 13, 15, and 17 are not to apply to trade-marks in respect of cotton goods in classes 23, 24, and 25, and the registrar is to advertise applications under the rules, for the registration of trade-marks in the cotton classes, showing, among other particulars, the places in London and Manchester where specimens of the marks are deposited for exhibition, and provision is made for consequent registration. By the further rule of December 23, 1878, it is provided that proprietors of old "combination stamps" for cotton piece goods, are to send to the Manchester office four representations of such combination stamps in such form and with such a description as may be from time to time required by the Commissioners of Patents. The additional rule of October 21, 1879, clears up a doubt which had been generally entertained, and declares that rules 57 to 63 do not apply to new cotton marks, and that applications for the registration of trade-marks for cotton goods, not being old marks, are to be made in the ordinary manner, subject to the proviso that marks which have been placed in the second class shall not be registered except by order of the court.

Thus the matter stands upon the rules, and it is interesting to consider the historical explanation given of these regulations by the Master of the Rolls. This is what he says in *In re Robinson*:—"The rules do not allow the registration of colour except in special cases as provided by rule 8, and the rules and additional rules applicable to cotton goods. There is nothing in the Act of Parliament about it at all. The Trade-Marks Act allowed the Lord Chancellor to make certain rules. He made rules after consultation with a great many people, and they became part of the Act. The difficulty of advertising was so great, and the difficulty of getting the shade of colour with chromo-lithography was so great, that colour was abandoned simply for practical purposes. But it was found necessary to treat all cotton marks as exceptional under rule 8, and to exhibit them at the Patent Museum, South Kensington, and also at certain places in London and Manchester, which are mentioned in the advertisement in the official paper under the Additional Rules, r. 1." So that it was only on account of certain practical difficulties in the way of advertising ordinary trade-marks in colour that the rule was established and enforced by the Commissioners of Patents or the Registrar of Trade Marks, that such ordinary mark should be registered without colour. But with regard to certain descriptions of marks, the whole distinctiveness of which consisted in the colour in which they were represented, registration in colour was essential, and for such marks

alone, therefore, was registration in colour permitted. The selvaige mark on cotton goods, consisting of threads variously coloured and arranged, running through the selvaige of the goods, afford a good example of such mark; or reference might be made, by way of illustration, to such marks as those appropriated by the Public Stores Act, 1875, to the public stores, such as white, black, or coloured worsted threads laid up with the yarns and the wire, respectively, for hempen cordage and wire rope; or blue or red cotton threads in each wick, or wicks of red cotton for candles. With respect to such marks, it is easy to see that registration in any other mode than by deposit would be futile, as the whole essence of the trade-mark consists in colour; but then we have the authority of the Master of the Rolls for saying, and, indeed, his whole decision in *In re Robinson* turned on the fact, that all marks for cotton goods are registered by deposit, so that very ordinary marks, if applicable to goods of that description, are registered in their usual colours, and are to be inspected at the places of deposit—i.e., according to the usual practice at present, at the Patent Museum, South Kensington, at the Trade-Marks Registry, Southampton-buildings, and at the Royal Exchange, Manchester. It certainly appears to be rather invidious that manufacturers of cotton goods should be placed on so different a footing from manufacturers of goods in other classes, and that marks which in any other class would be advertised and registered as devoid of colour, should be admitted to registration in a coloured form; but the case becomes still more anomalous when it is considered that in other classes manufacturers who adopt one form of trade-mark will obtain registration by deposit, while those who adopt another description of mark will have to put up with black and white. No doubt there is a certain advantage in having an abstract device protected, in whatever colour it may naturally be used in practice; but, after all, it is not so very great an advantage to have protection awarded for that which it is not desired to use.

REVIEWS.

COLLISIONS AT SEA.

A TREATISE ON THE LAW OF COLLISIONS AT SEA. By REGINALD G. MARSDEN, Esq., Barrister-at-Law. Stevens & Sons.

This is a useful and well-written summary of the law relating to a subject the importance of which is shown by a statement in the preface, that in the year 1878 there were in collision 1,790 sailing ships, and 836 steamships, in other words that about fifteen per cent. of the steam vessels and 3·6 per cent. of the sailing vessels of the world suffered loss from this cause alone. Mr. Marsden sets forth in small compass, and in a very readable shape, the general rules of law applicable to the subject of maritime collision, as laid down by statutes, or determined and defined in decided cases. The rule of the road at sea as it existed in its customary and unwritten form before it had become embodied and modified by Act of Parliament is also briefly stated, and the various changes which that rule has from time to time undergone are fully set out in their chronological order. The reported cases upon each division of the subject are intelligently collated; but with regard to one important matter of practice we wish to say a word. The question of costs in the Admiralty Division and on appeal is somewhat complicated. It seems, however, from the judgment of the Court of Appeal in *The Swansea and The Condor* (L. R. 4 P. D., at p. 120), that the Court of Appeal will now apply the ordinary rules of costs following the event; and the judgment of the same court in *The City of Manchester* (L. R. 5 P. D. 231) applies the general rule as to the discretion of the court. These cases throw doubt upon the decision of Sir Robert Phillimore in *The Matthew Cuy* (49 L. J. Prob. 47).

We think that Mr. Marsden might with safety have been more distinct upon this point than he has ventured to be; but, to do him justice, he refers to all the decisions down to the date of his publication, noting that the case of *The Daisy* was not followed in *The Swansea and The Condor*; and when he wrote, the decisions of Sir Robert Phillimore in *The City of Manchester* had not come before the Court of Appeal. In an appendix Mr. Marsden places in parallel columns the regulations for preventing collisions issued in 1863 and 1880; and also includes the local regulations of the principal ports of the United Kingdom. The whole book is marked by a thorough practical acquaintance with the subject, and ought, in our opinion, to be of great value to persons concerned in navigation as well as to lawyers.

STATUTE LAW.

STATUTE LAW: THE PRINCIPLES WHICH GOVERN THE CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF STATUTES. By E. WILBERFORCE, Barrister-at-Law. Stevens & Sons.

This is the third treatise upon the subject of the construction of statutes which has appeared in the last few years. We have frequently regretted the ignorance of statute law, as compared with case law, which tends to spoil many who pass for good lawyers, and we are glad to believe that the literary liveliness of the subject may be some evidence of increased professional interest in it. Mr. Wilberforce's book bears throughout conspicuous marks of research and care in treatment, but is wanting in originality and in criticism of the decisions which he has so well strung together. The little controversy about marginal notes, for instance, where we have Willes, J., in *Claydon v. Green* (L. R. 3 C. P. 522), and the Court of Appeal in *Attorney-General v. Great Eastern Railway Company* (28 W. R. 759, L. R. 11 Ch. D. 460) on the one side, and Jessel, M.R., in *Re Venour's Settled Estates* (L. R. 2 Ch. D. 525) on the other, might well have been treated more critically, and so might the question of "headings," and the question whether utterances in Parliament may or may not be referred to in construing a statute, and the question whether a statute is directory or imperative. We miss also any allusion to the Statute Law Revision Acts. There is a complete table of cases—which are numerous and sufficient, the only one which we have missed being *Reg. v. Haslingfield Overseers* (L. R. 9 Q. B. 209), in which the court referred to the Parliament Roll—but there is no table of statutes, and, though there is a good table of contents, the index is rather meagre. In spite of these faults the book is a good one, and we welcome its publication.

CASES OF THE WEEK.

BUILDING AGREEMENT—LICENCE TO SEIZURE MATERIALS—FORFEITURE—WAIVER—ACT OF BANKRUPTCY—BILLS OF SALE ACT, 1854 (17 & 18 VICT. c. 36), ss. 1, 7.—In a case of *Ex parte Nesbitt*, before the Court of Appeal on the 27th ult., the question arose whether a stipulation in a building agreement that, if the builder should not in all things observe and perform all things contained in the agreement, or if the intended buildings, or any of them, should not be commenced, or should at any time be left in an unfinished state, and for the space of twenty-eight days not regularly proceeded with, as therein provided, then, notwithstanding that no lease should have been granted in pursuance of the agreement, it should be lawful for the landowner to re-enter on the land and the houses then built or begun to be built thereon, and to expel therefrom the builder, and that on such re-entry all such buildings, materials, and things then in and about the premises should be forfeited to and become the property of the landowner "as and for liquidated and settled damages"—whether this stipulation required registration under the Bills of Sale Act in order to render it effectual as against the

trustee in the liquidation of the builder. The agreement provided for the erection by the builder of a number of houses upon a corresponding number of plots of land belonging to the landowner. The houses were to be completed at specified dates, and time was to be of the essence of the contract. Leases of the plots were to be from time to time granted by the landowner to the builder, as the houses were covered in to the satisfaction of the landowner. There was also a proviso that nothing in the agreement should operate as an actual or present demise of the premises or any part thereof, it being the true intent of the agreement that the builder should have the right only to enter upon the land for the purpose of the due performance of the agreement, and not otherwise, and that, in default of such due performance, the right and interest of the builder under the agreement should absolutely cease. Some of the houses were not completed at the specified dates, and, moreover, those houses had not been for the space of twenty-eight days regularly proceeded with according to the agreement, and the landowner re-entered on the plots on which those houses were being erected, and took possession of the buildings and materials thereon, but he had not taken more than a merely formal possession before the builder filed a liquidation petition. The agreement had not been registered as a bill of sale, and the trustee in the liquidation claimed the materials which had been seized by the landowner. Bacon, C.J., held that this claim was well founded, on the ground that the stipulation for forfeiture of the materials to the landowner was a "bill of sale" within the definition contained in section 7 of the Bills of Sale Act, 1854, as being "a licence to take possession of personal chattels as security for any debt." This decision was reversed by the Court of Appeal (JAMES, BRETT, and CORROD, L.J.J.), who were of opinion that, though the stipulation in question was a licence to take possession of personal chattels, there was no debt for which the possession was to be a security. BRETT, L.J., said that, even if there was a debt, the possession was taken, not as a security for it, but in discharge of it. It was argued on behalf of the trustee that, as the materials were to be forfeited to the landowner as liquidated damages, and damages are, by section 31 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, made provable in bankruptcy as a debt, it might be properly said that the possession was taken as security for a debt. But CORROD, L.J., said that the mere fact that the Bankruptcy Act made damages provable as a debt did not make damages a debt for the purposes of another statute. Another point raised was that the landowner had waived the forfeiture which had arisen from the non-completion of the houses at the specified dates, by making advances of money to the builder for the purposes of the agreement after that forfeiture had taken place. It was not necessary to decide the point, because the court was satisfied on the evidence that there was another continuing forfeiture by reason of the houses not having been regularly proceeded with for twenty-eight days. But their lordships intimated an opinion that the making of advances to the builder for the purposes of the agreement, after the expiration of the time appointed for the completion of the houses, would be strong evidence of waiver of the forfeiture by the landowner. And JAMES, L.J., said that it would require a good deal of consideration before he could assent to the decision of the Court of Common Pleas in *Doe v. Brindley* (12 Moore 37), that allowing a builder to proceed with the work after the expiration of the time limited for the completion of houses under a similar agreement, was not a waiver of the forfeiture. A third point raised was this: it was alleged that no possession of the materials was taken by the landowner until after the filing of the liquidation petition, and it was said that the landowner had no property in the materials until he had seized them, and that the licence only authorized him to seize that which was the property of the builder at the time of the seizure, and before the seizure the materials had become the property of the trustee, inasmuch as his title related back to the filing of the petition. The court, however, held that this objection was unfounded. JAMES, L.J., said that the trustee took all the property of the debtor, but he took it with all the liabilities which affected it in the debtor's hands, unless the property which he took as the legal representative of the debtor was enlarged by some express provision of the bankrupt law. There was no such provision applicable to the present case. The stipulation in the agreement was that in a certain event the

property of the builder should be taken by the landowner in full satisfaction of his claims against the builder. It was analogous to a sale of property with a power to re-purchase. BRETT, L.J., said that it was admitted that a sale of the materials by the builder to a third person would not have affected the rights of the landowner under the agreement, and this was conclusive to show that the title of the trustee in the liquidation was subject to the landowner's rights. COTTON, L.J., said that if by an assignment of the materials for value the right of the landowner could not be defeated, so long as the materials remained on the land, there was no provision in the Bankruptcy Act which placed him in a worse position as against the trustee. The order and disposition clause did not apply, because the landlord was not the true owner of the materials until he had exercised his right to seize them.—SOLICITORS, S. G. Ashwin; H. Montagu.

PRACTICE—BANKRUPTCY APPEAL—TIME FOR APPEALING FROM COUNTY COURT TO CHIEF JUDGE—BANKRUPTCY RULES, 1870, R. 143—BANKRUPTCY RULE OF MAY 26, 1873.—In a case of *Ex parte Hall*, before the Court of Appeal on the 27th ult., the question arose whether the time for appealing from a bankruptcy order of a county court to the Chief Judge has been varied by the Rules under the Judicature Act, or whether it is still regulated by the Bankruptcy Rule 143 of 1873, as interpreted by the Bankruptcy Rule of the 26th of May, 1873. Rule 143 provides that "an appeal against a decision or order of the Chief Judge in Bankruptcy, or a judge of a county court, shall be entered with the Registrar of Appeals within, and not later than, twenty-one days from the said decision or order." And rule 150 provided that "the office for entering bankruptcy appeals to be heard by the Court of Appeal in Chancery shall be closed during the ordinary vacations of the Court of Chancery, and the time during which such office shall be closed shall not be reckoned in the number of days ordered for the entering of appeals to be heard by such Court of Appeal in Chancery." This rule was rescinded by the rule of the 26th of May, 1873, which provided that "the office for entering bankruptcy appeals shall be open daily throughout the year, except on Sunday, Christmas Day, Good Friday, the Saturday after Good Friday, Monday and Tuesday in Easter week, and on any day appointed for a public fast or thanksgiving; . . . and the days on which the office shall be wholly closed shall not be reckoned in the number of days ordered for the entering of appeals." It was decided by the Chief Judge, in *Ex parte Hicks* (23 W. R. 552, L. R. 20 Eq. 143), that, by virtue of this rule, Sundays are not to be counted in reckoning the twenty-one days under rule 143, so that, in effect, twenty-four days are given for appealing, and this has ever since been accepted as the practice in appeals to the Court of Bankruptcy. But in *Ex parte Viney* (25 W. R. 354, L. R. 4 Ch. D. 794), the Court of Appeal held that the time for appealing from decisions of the Chief Judge to the Court of Appeal is now regulated entirely by the rules under the Judicature Act, and the Sundays are not to be excluded from the computation of the twenty-one days fixed by rule 15 of order 58. The court was not, however, then called upon to decide whether the old practice remains in regard to appeals from the county courts to the Chief Judge. In *Ex parte Hall*, this point was raised, and Bacon, C.J., held that, with regard to such appeals, the old practice is still in force, and that, consequently, Sundays are to be excluded from the computation of the twenty-one days under rule 143. The Court of Appeal (JAMES, BRETT, and COTTON, L.J.J.) affirmed this decision.—SOLICITORS, G. Presswell; Clarke, Rawlins, & Clarke.

COSTS—APPEAL—HABEAS CORPUS—PROHIBITION—APPEARANCE OF JUDGE TO DEFEND JURISDICTION—ORD. 58, R. 5.—The case of *In re Dale* (noted ante, p. 217) came again before the Court of Appeal on the 29th ult. upon the question of the costs of the appeal. The appellant, who had failed altogether in the Queen's Bench Division, succeeded in the Court of Appeal upon his application for a writ of *habeas corpus*, but failed in his application for a writ of prohibition to Lord Penzance, as the judge of the Provincial Court of Canterbury appointed under the Public Worship Regulation Act, 1874, on the ground that he had exceeded

his jurisdiction. The appellant claimed his costs of the appeal so far as it related to the *habeas corpus*, and in opposition to his claim it was urged that the proceeding was of a criminal nature, and that the court had no power to give the costs of it. The court (JAMES, BRETT, and COTTON, L.J.J.) held that the appellant was entitled to his costs. JAMES, L.J., said that it was an abuse of terms to call the application for a *habeas corpus* a criminal proceeding, as the offence for which the appellant was imprisoned was a contempt of court; and BRETT, L.J., said that when a *habeas corpus* was applied for on behalf of a prisoner, it was applied for on the ground that he was an innocent person, and there was nothing criminal in that. And, as to the costs of Lord Penzance, it was urged that he was not entitled to them, because it was unusual and unnecessary for a judge to appear to support his jurisdiction. The Queen's Bench Division did not give him his costs of his appearance in that court. The Court of Appeal held that there was nothing to exclude the application of the ordinary rule, and that Lord Penzance must be paid his costs of the appeal by the appellant.—SOLICITORS, Brooks, Jenkins, & Co.; J. Girdlestone; Solicitor to the Treasury.

STAY OF PROCEEDINGS PENDING APPEAL—APPLICATION TO COURT OF APPEAL—DEATH OF JUDGE OF FIRST INSTANCE—ORD. 58, RR. 16, 17.—In a case of *Bostock v. Pearson* an application was made *ex parte* to the Court of Appeal, on the 31st ult., with reference to a stay of proceedings pending an appeal from a decision of the Vice-Chancellor of the Lancaster Court. By virtue of rule 17 of order 58 such an application ought to be made in the first instance to the court whose decision is appealed from, but in the present case, owing to the death of Vice-Chancellor Little, it was impossible to make the application to that court. Under these circumstances the court (JAMES, BRETT, and COTTON, L.J.J.) thought that the application might be properly made at once to the Court of Appeal, and they gave leave to serve a notice of motion for the purpose.—SOLICITORS, Cross, Sons, & Riley.

RESTRICTIVE COVENANT AS TO USE OF LAND—"BEERSHOP."—In a case of *The London and Suburban Land and Building Company v. Field*, before the Court of Appeal on the 31st ult., a question arose upon the construction of a covenant in restriction of the use of land. The defendant was subject to a covenant not to erect on a piece of land, forming part of an estate laid out for building, "any public-house, tavern, or beershop," nor to use any house erected on the piece of land as such. A shop had been built on the piece of land, and the defendant who was the occupier of the shop, had obtained a licence authorizing him to sell beer there not to be drunk on the premises, and he was selling beer there accordingly. The action was brought to restrain him from breaking the covenant. Jessel, M.R., overruled a demurrer to the statement of claim. It was contended on behalf of the appellant that the word "beershop" had a technical meaning, equivalent to that of "beer-house," i.e., a place where beer was sold to be drunk on the premises, and that, consequently, there had been no breach of the covenant. The court (JAMES, BRETT, and COTTON, L.J.J.), however, following the decision of the Queen's Bench Division in *The Bishop of St. Albans v. Battersby* (36 W. R. 979, L. R. 3 Q. B. D. 359), held that the word "beershop" had no technical meaning distinct from its ordinary meaning, and that it must be taken to mean a shop where beer was sold, even if it was consumed off the premises.—SOLICITORS, Shum, Crossman, & Co.; T. W. Rogers.

CLUB—EXPULSION OF MEMBER—JURISDICTION OF COURT TO INTERFERE.—In a case of *Duckins v. Astroton*, before the Court of Appeal on the 1st inst., the question arose whether the court had jurisdiction to review the decision of a general meeting of the members of a club, expelling the plaintiff from membership. The original rules of the club contained no provisions for the expulsion of members, but there was a power to alter the rules by a majority at a general meeting, at which at least forty members were present. After the plaintiff became a member a new rule was passed under this power, which provided that in case the conduct of any member, either in or out of the club-house, should, in the opinion of the committee, be injurious to the character and

interest of the club, the committee should be empowered, if they deemed it expedient, to recommend such member to resign, and, if he should not comply within a month, the committee should then call a general meeting, and if a majority of two-thirds of that meeting should agree by ballot to the expulsion of the member, his name should be erased from the list, and he should forfeit all right and claim upon the property of the club. The plaintiff was an officer in the army, and he alleged that a general officer, who was also a member of the club, had, while acting as a member of a military court of inquiry, held for the purpose of investigating certain allegations made by the plaintiff, acted improperly and unfairly towards him. The plaintiff published a pamphlet, which contained allegations of gross misconduct against the Duke of Cambridge, the Secretary of State for War, and various officers in the army, including the general officer in question, and sent a copy of the pamphlet by post, addressed to the general officer at the Horse Guards, in an envelope having printed on the outside of it words imputing dishonourable conduct to him. The committee of the club called upon the plaintiff for an explanation. The plaintiff failed to give any explanation, and the committee then called upon him to resign his membership. This he declined to do, and a general meeting was then called to expel him, notice being given to him. The meeting was held, and a resolution for the expulsion of the plaintiff was passed by a majority of 108 to 36. The plaintiff, by his action, claimed a declaration that the resolution of the meeting was null and void, and it was contended on his behalf that the resolution had been come to in a capricious, unfair, and arbitrary manner, and not *bona fide*, and that the committee had been unduly biased against the plaintiff, several of them being officers in the army and in the same regiment as the officer to whom the pamphlet had been sent. Jessel, M.R., though he said (*vide* 23 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 681) that he should himself have felt very great difficulty in holding that the mere sending a copy of the pamphlet to a member of the club, not at the club, in an envelope with the objectionable words printed on it, was "injurious to the character and interests of the club," he could not take upon himself to say that the committee had acted so unreasonably as to enable him to impute legal malice to them. He could not say that they, or the general meeting, had acted without reasonable or probable cause, or that the allegation of malice was sufficiently made out. He therefore dismissed the action. This decision was affirmed by the Court of Appeal (JAMES, BRETT, and COTTON, L.JJ.) on substantially the same grounds. JAMES, L.J., said that he entirely agreed with what was said by the Lords Commissioners in *Judrueck v. Snell* (2 M. & G. 216), in relation to the removal of directors of a company by a meeting of the shareholders, which was directly applicable to the case of a club. If the meeting of the members had been duly convened and had power to decide the particular question, the court had no jurisdiction to interfere unless it could be shown that the decision was so grossly unfair and unreasonable that it could not have been arrived at except from some malicious motive. If the committee and the general meeting were not acting fraudulently, and there was no ground for assuming that they were so acting, they were the sole judges whether the rule as to expulsion ought to be applied, and the court could not interfere. His lordship, however, was of opinion, with deference to the Master of the Rolls, that nothing could be more injurious to the character and interests of a club than the conduct of the plaintiff in sending the pamphlet in question. BRETT, L.J., said that, unless there was clear proof of *malus fides*, which there was not in this case, the court had no authority to consider whether what was done by the meeting was reasonable or not, or to interfere with their decision, even if of opinion that it was wholly beyond reason and without reason. — SOLICITORS, Gascoite, Wadham, & Daw; Nichol, Mawley, & Co.

PRACTICE.—MOTION ON ADMISSIONS IN THE PLEADINGS.—RULES OF COURT, 1875, ORD. 40, R. 11.—RIGHT OF DEFENDANT TO MOVE WHO HAS NOT COUNTER-CLAIMED.—RIGHT TO "RELIEF."—In a case of *Pascoe v. Richards*, before the Master of the Rolls on the 29th ult., the defendant had put in a defence to the statement of claim, but had not counter-claimed for any relief. The plaintiff then replied specially, and the defendant rejoined by joining issue on the reply. The defendant now moved under ord. 40, r. 11, that the action might be dismissed, on the ground that, on the admitted facts

in the pleadings, the plaintiff had not disclosed any case for relief against the defendant. The material words of the rule are as follows:—"Any party to an action may, at any stage thereof, apply to the court or a judge for such order as he may, upon any admissions of fact in the pleadings, be entitled to, without waiting for the determination of any other question between the parties. Any such application may be made by motion so soon as the right of the party applying to the relief claimed has appeared from the pleadings." The arguments turned mainly on the question whether the defendant could be said to be entitled to any "relief," as he had not counter-claimed, and a decision of Hall, V.C., of *Litton v. Litton* (L. R. 3 Ch. D. 793), was relied on in support of the view that a defendant, under the above circumstances, was not within the rule. Jessel, M.R., was of opinion that the motion was well founded. If Hall, V.C., had decided the point, he should have followed his decision; but, in his opinion, he had not decided the point that arose in the present case. In *Litton v. Litton*, default had been made in replying, and the Vice-Chancellor held that the proper mode in such a case was for the defendant to give notice of trial or to move to dismiss. Moreover, if the books of practice had been uniform as to the construction of the rule, he should probably have followed the general rule adopted by them, but they were not uniform as to the construction to be adopted, and he must, therefore, construe the rule himself. Now, on the rule, it was clear that "any party" could move, and those words must include a defendant. The later words were more ambiguous, and the difficulty was as to the meaning of the word "relief." In other places in the rules where the word "relief" occurred, it was not confined to its old narrow meaning of the "relief" claimed by bill in chancery, but was to be used in its ordinary and wider sense. He did not see that a defendant could ask for greater relief than to have the action dismissed, and he thought the word was used in that sense. He was, moreover, of opinion that the first and enacting part of the rule was not to be cut down by the later portion, which only showed the way in which the enacting part was to be carried out, unless by clear and unequivocal words. On the construction of the rule, and on the reason of the thing, he thought the defendant, in such a case as the above, came within the rule; and he should, therefore, not allow the objection to the motion on that ground. On the merits, however, his lordship dismissed the motion. — SOLICITORS, Doltman & Pritchard; Henry Aird.

WILL.—GIFT OF RESIDUE TO WIDOW FOR LIFE WITH REMAINDER TO CHILDREN.—ADVANCES TO CHILDREN.—HOTCHPOT CLAUSE.—INTEREST.—In a case of *Re Rees, Rees v. George*, before the Master of the Rolls on the 29th ult., the testator, by his will, gave the income of his residuary estate to his widow for life, and after her death, after legacies to his sons, directed his residuary estate to be divided amongst all his children at twenty-one, or marriage. The will contained a declaration that every sum of money advanced to his children during his life, or any money paid by the testator towards their maintenance or education, should be brought into hotchpot and accounted for as part of the respective share of such child in his residuary estate. The testator died in 1860, and the chief clerk certified that he left nine children, all of whom attained their majority, and that he had made advances to four of them. The widow died in 1880, whereupon the residuary estate became divisible, and on a petition for payment out of court of the nine shares, the question arose from what date the advanced children, in bringing their advances into hotchpot, were to be charged with interest on their shares. JESSEL, M.R., was of opinion that the interest was to be charged on the advances from the date of the death of the widow, and not from the date of the testator's death. — SOLICITORS, Warriner; Clarke, Woodcock, & Ryland.

HUSBAND AND WIFE.—PROTECTION ORDER.—DISCHARGE.—DEATH OF WIFE.—WILL.—SEPARATE ESTATE.—PROBATE ACTION.—COUNTER-CLAIM.—DIVORCE ACT, 1857 (20 & 21 VICT. C. 85), SS. 21, 23.—JUDICATURE ACT, 1873, s. 24, SUB-SECTION 3.—In the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division, on the 1st inst., the case of *Mudge v. Adams* was argued upon a demurrer to portions of the statement of defence and counter-claim. The plaintiff propounded the will of the wife of the defendant, and the statement of claim alleged that the deceased had

appointed the plaintiff as her executor by a will duly executed by her when living apart from her husband, after having obtained a protection order, and being possessed of separate estate. The defendant alleged in his statement of defence and counter-claim that the protection order had been obtained by his wife without his knowledge, and by means of fraud and false representations, and that he had not been guilty of desertion. By his counter-claim he asked that the court should pronounce against the will and grant letters of administration to him as the lawful husband of the deceased, and also for a declaration that the protection order was fraudulent and void, and should be set aside and discharged. The plaintiff replied that the defendant for a long time during the lifetime of the deceased knew of and acquiesced in the existence of the protection order, and allowed the deceased to act thereunder, and was thereby estopped from now questioning its validity. The plaintiff also demurred to so much of the statement of defence and counter-claim as alleged that the protection order was obtained without his knowledge and by means of fraud and false representations, and ought to be set aside, and that the defendant had not been guilty of desertion. It was argued by the plaintiff's counsel that the protection order precluded the defendant from disputing the will of the deceased, and that he could not, after his wife's death, take any step to have the order discharged. HANSEN, P., stopped the argument of the counsel for the defendant, and overruled the demurrer, upon the general principle that an order obtained by fraud may be set aside at the instance of the party complaining of the fraud, unless the rights of innocent parties would be prejudiced by so doing. The interests of the executor or of the legatees under a will made by a married woman who has obtained a protection order were not such rights as would be prejudiced by the discharge of the order, and the making of a will was not among the "acts" done by the wife between the making and the discharge of the protection order, which are specially protected by the 21 & 22 Vict. c. 108, s. 8, in the event of the order being discharged. The 20 & 21 Vict. c. 85, s. 21, placed a wife who had obtained a protection order in the same position, with regard to property and contracts, as if she had obtained a decree of judicial separation, while section 23 enabled a husband or wife against whom a decree of judicial separation has been pronounced, "at any time thereafter," to present a petition to reverse the decree, on the ground that it was obtained in his or her absence, or that there was reasonable ground for the desertion. The words "at any time thereafter" showed that the death of the husband or wife was not a bar to the application for the reversal of a decree of judicial separation, and for the same reason the death of the wife did not preclude an application to discharge the protection order, although, no doubt, it cast a heavy onus upon the husband. Secondly, the defendant was entitled to raise the question of the discharge of the protection order in the probate action, since he had properly claimed by his pleadings, in respect of a legal right, such relief as the court could have granted "in any suit instituted for that purpose, against the same plaintiff," within section 24, sub section 3, of the Judicature Act, 1873. In the present case the procedure was simplified, because both the probate and the discharge of the protection order were matters within the jurisdiction of the same division. He therefore held the counter-claim to be good, but reserved all questions as to costs until he had heard all the facts of the case.—SOLICITORS, *Poole, Hughes, & Poole; Wedlake & Letts.*

A Queen's Counsel writes to the *Times*:—"As one of those who signed the requisition for the meeting of the bar, which I have just left, I beg to say that, whatever its verdict, it seems to me to be valueless. It was impossible to hear, hardly more possible to see, and very many of the working members of the bar, more especially of those in the fullest practice, are conspicuous by their absence. If it is a mere counting of noses, well; if anything more, it is simply valueless as any sort of aid in deciding a very grave question once and for all. I may add that three other working members of the bar—one a Queen's Counsel of long standing, whose experience and opinion are worth consideration—left at the same time as myself and for the same reason."

CASES BEFORE THE BANKRUPTCY REGISTRARS.

(Before Mr. REGISTRAR PEPPY, acting as Chief Judge.)

Jan. 25.—*Ex parte Foreman and another, Re Roberts.*

A bill of sale was expressed to be made in consideration of £1,250, being a debt owing to the grantee by the grantor, £24 for interest due, and £100 then paid by the grantee to the grantor. In fact the grantor received £94 only by cheque, £8 being deducted for one year's interest, in anticipation, on the £100.

Held, that the deed was, by section 8 of the Bills of Sale Act, 1878, void against the trustees in the liquidation of the grantor.

This was an application on behalf of the trustee of the property of Edwin Roberts for an order declaring that a bill of sale, dated 9th of June, 1879, and made between the debtor of the one part, and James Miles of the other part, was null and void against the said trustees, and that the property comprised therein, and the proceeds thereof, belonged to them.

By the bill of sale, which was registered pursuant to the Bills of Sale Act, 1878, the debtor, carrying on business as a pawnbroker, assigned to James Miles, who now claimed to be entitled to the benefit of the security, all his furniture, goods, fixtures, chattels, and other effects upon the premises occupied by him at No. 133, St. James's-road, Holloway, the pledges and stock-in-trade therein, and also all other goods, chattels, and effects which might thereafter come into or upon the said premises or any other premises of the debtor during the time any money might be due under and by virtue of the said bill of sale, by way of security for the sum of £1,250, in the said indenture expressed to be a debt owing to J. Miles by the debtor for money lent, and the sum of £24 for interest due thereon, and a further sum of £100, in the said indenture expressed to be then paid by Miles to the debtor, making thereby the sum of £1,374, with interest thereon at the rate of £6 per cent. per annum.

The sum of £100 was not, in fact, paid by Miles to the debtor at the time. The debtor received £94 only, by a cheque for that amount, dated 6th of June, 1879, the sum of £6 having been deducted and retained by Miles for one year's interest on the £100. There was a question upon the evidence whether a sum of £13 was not also paid by Miles, being the premium upon a policy of insurance effected on the debtor's life and deposited with Miles by way of security.

On the 9th of April, 1880, the debtor filed a petition for liquidation of his affairs, and at the first meeting trustees were appointed, with a committee of inspection.

Robson, in support for the application:—Apart from any other question the bill of sale is void against the trustees by reason of the consideration for which it was given not having been truly set forth in accordance with section 8 of the Bills of Sale Act, 1878. If anything be deducted for interest or discount the fact should be stated: *Ex parte National Mercantile Bank, Re Haynes* (28 W. R. 848, L. R. 15 Ch. D. 42, 23 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 504). In the present case interest in anticipation was deducted, and *Ex parte Charing Cross Advance and Deposit Bank v. Parker* (L. R. 16 Ch. D. 35) applies. He also cited *Ex parte Chalmers* (28 W. R. 205).

E. C. Wilks, for the respondent:—It is not clear from the evidence that the £94 was the only sum paid. But assuming that it was, the practice of deducting expenses is well known. *Ex parte Chalmers* shows that the expenses attendant upon the mortgage may properly be deducted from the amount advanced.

Mr. REGISTRAR PEPPY said he could not distinguish the present case from *Ex parte Charing Cross Advance and Deposit Bank, In re Parker*. The amount deducted was not so large as the agreed sum in that case (£30), but still it was in the nature of a deduction for interest; and the Court of Appeal had laid it down that, when interest was deducted from the consideration, the deed was, by section 8 of the Bills of Sale Act, void as against the trustee in the liquidation of the grantor. He must hold, therefore, that the bill of sale in this case was in valid, but the order would be made without costs.

Solicitors for the trustees, *Wright & Law*.
Solicitor for the respondent, *Novell*.

OBITUARY.

VICE-CHANCELLOR LITTLE.

Mr. George Little, Q.C., Vice-Chancellor of the Chancery Court of the Duchy of Lancaster, died on the 27th ult. Vice-Chancellor Little was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in Easter Term, 1840, and practised for many years in the Court of Chancery, and in the Lancaster Palatine Court. He became a Queen's Counsel in 1866, when he selected the court of Vice-Chancellor Malins, but his practice was chiefly in bankruptcy appeals. In 1871 he succeeded the late Sir John Wickens as Vice-Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, and he held that office till his death. About four years ago he retired from practice, and he had since devoted the whole of his attention to his judicial duties. Mr. Little fully justified the expectations that were entertained at the time of his appointment, and he obtained the esteem and respect of the bar, and the confidence of the suitors in his court. It may be remembered that about two months ago his judgment in *Duncan v. North and South Wales Bank*, which had been reversed by the Court of Appeal, was unanimously restored in the House of Lords.

SOCIETIES.

LAW ASSOCIATION.

At the usual monthly meeting of the directors, held at the hall of the Incorporated Law Society, Chancery-lane, on Thursday, 3rd of February, the following being present, viz., Mr. Deaborough (chairman), and Messrs. Boodle Deaborough, jun., Hedger, Sydney Smith, Styant, and A. B. Carpenter (secretary), a grant of £5 was made to a non-member, and the ordinary general business was transacted.

BIRMINGHAM LAW SOCIETY.

The annual meeting of the Birmingham Law Society was held on the 28th ult., at the Library Room, Wellington-passade, Bennett's-hill. Mr. J. Marigold, president of the society, occupied the chair, and among those present were Messrs. W. S. Allen, C. F. Arnold, T. Assinder, S. Balden, jun., W. W. Browett, A. G. Buller, J. F. Butlin, A. Canning, J. B. Carlake, J. Chirm, E. M. Coleman, H. D. Crompton, J. E. Deakin, E. Docker, T. S. Eldowes (Sutton Coldfield), M. A. Fitter, T. A. Garland, A. Godlee, H. M. Goodman, E. J. Hayes (town clerk), T. Horton (hon. secretary), W. Horton, J. Jelf, G. J. Johnson, W. Johnson, E. H. Lee, T. G. Lee, L. W. Lewis (Walsall), W. Lowe, J. Marigold, T. Marlow (Walsall), T. Martineau, C. E. Mathews, W. Morgan, H. New, C. E. Newey, H. Parish, R. J. Parr, R. A. Pincot, G. T. S. Plant, W. H. Powell, E. B. Rawlings, J. Rider, Joseph Rowlands, Jacob Rowlands, T. H. Russell, C. T. Saunders, S. R. Shore, T. S. Smith, G. T. Smith, S. N. Solomon, and J. T. Springthorpe.

The report was taken as read.

The President, in moving its adoption, drew attention to its principal features. He remarked that the number of members showed satisfactory increase, and that it was also gratifying to see the exercise of the privilege of using the library by the article clerks. The financial report was also satisfactory. Referring to the library, the president said too much praise could not be awarded to their hon. secretary for the immense labour he had brought to bear upon, and the extraordinary time he had given to, the compilation of the catalogue. The library was founded in 1832, when it consisted of 647 volumes; in 1840, the number had increased to 900, in 1857 to 1,450, in 1865 to 1,903, in 1878 to 2,599, and at the present time contained 3,500. Parliament had not, during the past year, been able to effect any changes in the law, and from the Irish stew at present before the House of Commons it did not appear likely that there would be very much improvement or many new laws during the present session. There was, however, promised a Bankruptcy Bill, to which the President of the Board of Trade had promised to give his very great at-

tention; and he believed it was the intention of that gentleman to take great credit for making the Bill one of the best measures that could be framed. He (the president) also believed there was almost an avowed intention of getting the measure through without the intervention of the solicitors. He could only say, if the solicitors had no hand in framing the measure, that the new Bankruptcy Bill would be very unlikely to carry out that which it was desired to do. If, however, they were taken into consultation by the persons dealing with the subject, the joint action would result in the passing of a proper measure.

Mr. CARSLAKE seconded the motion.

Mr. T. MARTINEAU spoke with reference to the evils in connection with the present administration of justice in the provinces, and drew attention to the remedies proposed by the conference at Liverpool. He asked them, if Liverpool, with its three civil assizes each year, felt the evil consequences of the present system, how much worse off was a town of the magnitude and commercial importance of Birmingham, which had either to send cases for trial at Warwick or London, or perhaps had to send for settlement or arbitration? A great many people had felt that Birmingham should be not only an assize town, but the centre of an assize district. He was glad to point out that the scheme agreed upon at Liverpool would, if carried out, give Birmingham more than had been anticipated in their most sanguine moments. It not only proposed that Birmingham should be the centre for civil and criminal purposes, but that Birmingham should practically have a resident judge and continuous sittings. He had always taken the greatest interest in the question of assizes for Birmingham, but he had known no scheme so comprehensive, complete, and effective, as this brought forward by the Liverpool Society, and it should receive no heartier support than from the town of Birmingham.

Mr. SAUNDERS also expressed his approval of the scheme, and added that the resolutions passed at Liverpool had been adopted at the conference of Associated Provincial Societies in London, and would be submitted forthwith to the Government, in the hope that they would be taken into immediate consideration. Of course, the important question would arise, that in Birmingham there were no courts in which the assizes could be held. In this respect, they were in the hands of the town council, but no doubt with such influential members as Messrs. Johnson and Martineau this difficulty would receive consideration. Referring to the present imperfect means of educating law students in Birmingham, Mr. Saunders announced the proposed appointment of a reader for the elementary classes, and a lecturer for those more advanced, in conjunction with the Council of the Incorporated Law Society, the examination committee of which had decided to report to the council in favour of a grant in aid of the payment of the fees.

The report and statement of accounts were then adopted.

The CHAIRMAN next proposed, "That this meeting tenders its hearty thanks and congratulations to Mr. Thomas Horton, the honorary secretary, on the occasion of the publication of the new catalogue of the library, and hereby instructs the committee to take into their consideration in what manner, agreeable to Mr. Horton himself, the society can record their grateful sense of the benefits conferred on the society, the profession, and the town, by his long-continued and successful labours in the increase, arrangements, and cataloguing the library."

Mr. G. J. JOHNSON seconded the resolution, speaking in the highest terms of the services of Mr. Horton, who, he said, had made their library the finest out of London. The motion was cordially agreed to, and

Mr. HORTON, in expressing his acknowledgments, referred to the assistance he had received in the compilation of the subject-index from his partner, Mr. E. H. Lee.

Mr. J. E. DEAKIN moved as a recommendation to the committee to consider whether some action should not be taken to enable solicitors to enforce the return of fees paid to counsel in respect of the work undertaken, but not performed by them.

Mr. T. G. LEE seconded the motion, but

Mr. G. J. JOHNSON advised them not to take up the matter unless they were prepared to go to the root of the evil and urge the total revision of the existing understanding, making arrangements between barristers and those by whom they were instructed of the nature of an ordinary contract, with the usual responsibilities for non-fulfilment.

Upon the suggestion of the CHAIRMAN and other gentlemen, who promised that the committee would take the question into consideration, the motion was withdrawn.

The election of members upon the committee concluded the proceedings.

After the conclusion of the meeting a telegram was received from the Incorporated Law Society stating that the gold medal prize had been awarded to Mr. George Francis Huggins and Mr. Arthur Leslie Crookford, bracketed equal.

The following are extracts from the report of the committee:—

Members.—Your committee report a satisfactory progress in the prosperity of the society, the number of members now being 217 as against 206 for the year 1880.

Parliamentary.—The Bills introduced by the late Government before the dissolution—viz., the Settled Land Bill, the Conveyancing and Law of Property Bill, and the Solicitors' Remuneration Bill—were considered by your committee, but before any action was determined upon Parliament was dissolved. The measures were reintroduced into the House of Lords on the assembly of the new Parliament, but it soon became evident that there would be no legislation with reference thereto in the then session.

Professional Remuneration.—This question has received considerable attention from your committee, who are prepared to co-operate in any movement to give effect to the principle of remuneration by commission, believing that any injustice to the profession in the scale adopted would soon be relieved.

Bankruptcy.—The attention of your committee was directed to the Bill introduced by the late Government, but the measure was not taken up by the present Government in the late session. The legislation promised for the present session will at once be considered by your committee.

Administration of Justice.—On the request of the Liverpool Law Society your vice-president, Mr. Saunders, with Mr. Martineau, attended, as a deputation from your committee, at a conference at Liverpool upon this important subject, the law societies of Manchester and Newcastle-on-Tyne being also represented. The following resolutions were adopted at this meeting, and the same are to be taken into consideration at a further conference of representatives to a meeting of the Associated Provincial Law Societies, convened for the 22nd of January instant:—

1. The inadequacy of the present arrangements for the trial of causes in the large centres of population has long been admitted. The causes of this state of things have been fully stated on previous occasions, and it is unnecessary now to do more than shortly to recapitulate them.

2. The opportunities for the trial of causes are not sufficiently numerous, and this leads to accumulation of business at the assizes now held. The time allowed at the assizes for disposing of the civil business is insufficient, and this causes arrangements of the most inconvenient kind to be made for the dispatch of business. The trial of causes is unduly hurried, and questions of law arising on trials, instead of being decided, as they ought to be, after argument, by the judge during the sitting, are postponed for argument and decision in London at some subsequent period, thus greatly increasing the expenses.

3. The consequences to the public interested are that the decisions of questions of great importance are often unduly delayed; that causes, if tried at all, are frequently disposed of under conditions of haste and pressure which are very unsatisfactory; that causes which both parties desire to have tried, and in the preparation of which for trial great trouble and expense have been incurred, are, against their wish, and under the alternative of being made *remans* to a subsequent assize, either referred to arbitration, which simply means the waste of the money spent in preparing for trial, and the adoption of a method of decision almost invariably tedious, costly, and distasteful to the parties concerned, or compromise, equally distasteful to them, on terms which might as well have been arranged before the expense and trouble of getting up the case for trial had been incurred.

4. For these grievances the most effectual remedy would seem to be the adoption of the system advocated by the present Attorney-General in the House of Commons, on the 21st of March, 1879—viz., the establishment of local

centres of the High Court of Justice, with continuous sittings at such centres, for the trial of all causes arising within the districts attached to them.

5. It is suggested that Liverpool, Manchester, Leeds, and Birmingham should be constituted local centres, with proper districts allotted to them, and that at each local centre, subject to arrangements for reasonable vacations, and perhaps for occasional sittings for criminal business, a judge of the High Court should be continuously engaged in disposing of all civil actions arising within the district.

6. It is not contemplated or desired that judges should reside permanently at local centres. The rotation in which they would attend, and the period during which the rotation judge would remain at the local centre, are matters which could best be arranged by the judges themselves with reference to their other engagements.

7. All questions of law arising on the trial of any action should be decided without delay at the local centre by the judge before whom the action is tried.

LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL.

INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

FINAL EXAMINATIONS, 1880.

Special Prizes.

Reardon Prize.—To Charles Thwaites, who, from among the candidates during the year 1880, has shown himself best acquainted with the theory, principles, and practice of the law, and attained honorary distinction, the council have awarded to him the prize founded by Miss Ellen Reardon, in memory of the connection of her father, Mr. Daniel Reardon, of London, with the legal profession. Mr. Thwaites served his clerkship with Mr. Frederick Wm. Fisher, of Doncaster; and Messrs. Van Sanden & Cumming, of London, and obtained a prize in June, 1880.

Timpron Martin Prize for candidates from Liverpool.—To Walter Herbert Cowl, who, from among the candidates from Liverpool in the year 1880 passed the best examination, and who attained honorary distinction, the council have awarded the prize, consisting of a gold medal, founded by Mr. Timpron Martin, of Liverpool. Mr. Cowl served his clerkship with Mr. Arthur Edwin Cowl, of Liverpool and Great Yarmouth, and obtained a prize in June, 1880.

Atkinson Prize for candidates from Liverpool or Preston.—To Walter Herbert Cowl, who, from among the candidates from Liverpool or Preston in the year 1880 has shown himself best acquainted with the law of real property and the practice of conveyancing, has otherwise passed a satisfactory examination, and has attained honorary distinction, the council have awarded the prize, consisting of a gold medal, founded by Mr. John Atkinson, of Liverpool. Mr. Cowl served his clerkship with Mr. Arthur Edwin Cowl, of Liverpool and Great Yarmouth, and obtained a prize in June, 1880.

Broderip Prize for real property and conveyancing (open to all candidates).—Charles Thwaites, having, among the candidates in the year 1880 shown himself best acquainted with the law of real property and the practice of conveyancing, having passed a satisfactory examination, and having attained honorary distinction, the council have awarded to him the prize, consisting of a gold medal, founded by Mr. Francis Broderip, of Lincoln's-inn. Mr. Thwaites served his clerkship with Mr. Frederick Wm. Fisher, of Doncaster; and Messrs. Van Sanden & Cumming, of London, and obtained a prize in June, 1880.

Scott Scholarship (open to all candidates).—Charles Thwaites being, in the opinion of the council, the candidate best acquainted with the theory, principles, and practice of law, they have awarded to him the scholarship founded by Mr. John Scott, of Lincoln's-inn-fields, London. Mr. Thwaites served his clerkship with Mr. Frederick Wm. Fisher, of Doncaster; and Messrs. Van Sanden & Cumming, of London, and obtained a prize in June, 1880.

Birmingham Law Society's Prize for candidates from Birmingham.—The examiners also reported that among the candidates from Birmingham in the year 1880 Mr. Arthur Leslie Crookford and Mr. George Francis Huggins passed the best examination, and were of equal merit. Mr. Crook-

ford obtained a prize in November, and Mr. Huggins obtained a prize in April of that year. Mr. Crockford served his clerkship with Messrs. Johnson, Barclay, & Johnson, of Birmingham; and Messrs. Burton, Yeaves, & Hart, of London. Mr. Huggins served his clerkship with Messrs. Rowlands, Bagnall, & Co., of Birmingham.

Heelis Prize candidates from Manchester or Salford.—To James Douglas, who from among the candidates from Manchester or Salford in the year 1880 passed the best examination, and who attained honorary distinction, the council have awarded the prize, consisting of a gold medal, founded in memory of the late Mr. Stephen Heelis, of Manchester. Mr. Douglas served his clerkship with Messrs. Lingards & Newby of Manchester; and Messrs. Cunliffe, Beaumont, & Davenport, of London, and obtained a prize in June, 1880.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

Tuesday, February 1, 1881.—Mr. Bartlett in the chair.—Mr. S. T. Biggs and Mr. Thornton Toozood were elected members. The adjourned debate on the question, "Is the policy of the Ministry as foreshadowed in the Queen's Speech satisfactory?" was continued by Messrs. Hutton, Bower, C. E. Barry, and Van Sommer in the negative, and by Messrs. W. F. Barry, Kirk, and F. J. Green in the affirmative. Mr. Napier having replied, the question, on being put to the society, was carried in the affirmative, by the casting vote of the chairman.

UNITED LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

A meeting of this society was held at Clement's-inn on Wednesday evening, February 2, Mr. A. D. Maclaren in the chair. The following gentlemen were elected as members of the society—namely, Messrs. G. P. Symes, C. J. Lawrence, and P. H. White, and Mr. F. O. Edlin was elected as secretary for the societies in union. Mr. W. Dawson announced that the James Prize had been adjudged by Mr. E. Clarke, Q.C., to Mr. E. P. Ritley. The society was occupied with the discussion of private business until a late hour, when the motion on the paper, "That it is to the interest of the public that severer restrictions should be put upon admission to the learned professions," was adjourned until the first meeting of the society in March.

A meeting of the society will be held on Monday, February 7, at the Law Institution, when Mr. E. L. Breton will open the question for discussion, "Was the case of *Angus v. Dalton* rightly decided?"

MANCHESTER LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

The eighth meeting of the session was held on Tuesday, February 1, at the Law Library, Cross-street chambers, at 6.30 o'clock, when the chair was taken by W. Cobbett, Esq., solicitor. The following was the subject for discussion:—"The owner of a lawn-mower exhibits it in proper working order in a public market for sale, and leaves it for a few minutes. During his absence some children play with the machine, and one gets injured. Is the owner liable for the injury done to the child?" Mr. Birch opened in the affirmative, whilst Mr. Lowndes supported the negative. After an animated debate, in which, additionally to those before mentioned, Messrs. Ryner, Price, Batchelor, Bycroft, Hielop, Norton, Ellison, and Cward took part, the opener replied, and the learned chairman summed up in favour of the negative contention, when the question was so decided by the society. Messrs. Abell and Brantwaire were elected ordinary members of the society. A vote of thanks to the chairman concluded the evening's proceedings.

BIRMINGHAM LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

The thirty-fourth annual meeting and dinner in connection with the Birmingham Law Students' Society were held on Wednesday evening, at the Grand Hotel. Mr. J. MOTTERAM, Q.C., judge of the county court, presided; and there was a good attendance. The usual loyal toasts were proposed by the PRESIDENT; after which

Mr. O'CONNOR read the report of the committee, which showed that during the year 6 honorary members had joined the society and 10 had left. The total number of honorary members was 227, against 220 last year. During the year 16 new ordinary members joined the society, 11 were admitted solicitors, and thus would become honorary members, while

11 ceased to be members of the society. The number of ordinary members was 81, against 87 last year; and the total number of members of the society was 300, being comprised of 15 barristers, 212 solicitors, and 82 bar students and articled clerks.—Mr. BARNOWS read the treasurer's report, which showed the receipts to have been £162 11s. 1½d., and the expenditure £82 2s. 0½d., leaving a favourable balance of £80 9s. 1d.—The reports were unanimously adopted, the result of the election of the committee for the ensuing year was announced, and the annual essay and lecture prizes were presented.

The PRESIDENT then delivered an address, in which he spoke of the many changes in the law which had taken place within the last twenty years—changes which in many respects, although not in all, had been very beneficial in their results. The distinction between law and equity no longer existed, the Judicature Act had broken it down, and law and equity could now be administered by the same judge in the same court. The present Lord Chancellor and Lord Cairns had brought about a great many reforms in the laws of the country, and although the changes had not at present produced absolutely beneficial results, yet the imperfections would undoubtedly in time be removed. He next called attention to the amazing and almost incredible increase of litigation within the last forty years, although the number of the courts and judges had been increased. The arrears in the courts were enormous, and the country was crying out for redress. Had it not been for the creation of county courts in 1846, and the extension of the jurisdiction, it was scarcely possible to conceive what would have been the state of things which must have existed owing to the inefficient legal machinery which was engaged in the performance of the work which devolved upon the courts. In 1878, the amount for which plaints were entered was £3,464,750, and the work necessarily attendant upon those plaints would have fallen in a great measure upon the High Courts, had it not been for the establishment of the county courts. In 1878 the county courts tried—over and above what he had referred to—more than 1,200 causes, the whole of which, had it not been for the extended jurisdiction given them, must have been tried by the High Courts, inasmuch as two-thirds of the causes were for sums between £20 and £50, and the remaining one-third were for sums exceeding £50. In conclusion, he pointed out that it was necessary the work of the judges should be lightened as much as possible, and then he proposed "The Birmingham Law Students' Society."

Mr. O'CONNOR responded, and Mr. LOWE gave "The Bench and the Bar," to which Mr. J. M. NEALE replied.

Mr. LUDLOW gave "The Birmingham Law Society," and Mr. SAUNDERS responded.

The last toast was the health of "The President," which was proposed by Mr. ROGERS.

GRAY'S INN MOOT SOCIETY.

A meeting of this society took place in Gray's-inn Hall, on Thursday evening, the 20th ult., before J. A. Russell, Esq., Q.C., as president. The question for discussion was as follows:—"Supposing the case of *Sullivan v. Mitcalfe and others* (L. R. 5 C. P. D.), to be carried by appeal to the House of Lords, what order ought the House to make on the hearing of the appeal?" The appellants from the decision of the court below were represented by Mr. H. Eleum, barrister, of Gray's-inn, and Mr. E. C. Robinson, student, of Gray's-inn. The respondents were represented by Mr. A. A. Pranker, barrister, of Lincoln's-inn, and Mr. C. A. V. Conybeare, student, of Gray's-inn. The meeting was largely attended by members of the other Inns of Court. The learned president confirmed the decision of the Court of Appeal.

The second meeting of the term was held in Gray's-inn Hall, on Tuesday, 25th ult., when John Pearson, Esq., Q.C., presided. The parties to the question in issue (involving some difficult points of equity practice) were represented by Mr. E. H. Pickersgill, student, Inner Temple, and Mr. E. Clayton, student, Gray's-inn, for the plaintiffs; and by Mr. A. R. Ingpen, barrister, Middle Temple, and Mr. E. Baddy, student, Gray's-inn, for the defendants. Judgment in favour of the latter.

The annual general meeting of the society was held on Thursday evening, the 27th of January, when the follow-

ing gentlemen were elected to act as secretaries for the ensuing year. Mr. C. A. Vansittart Coneybeare, barrister, Gray's-inn; Mr. F. B. de M. Gibbons, student, Gray's-inn; Mr. E. C. Robinson, barrister, Gray's-inn; Mr. E. H. Pickersgill, student, Inner Temple; Mr. A. R. Ingpen, barrister, Middle Temple; and Mr. A. A. Franckerd, barrister, Lincoln's-inn.

LEGAL APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. HENRY MASON BOMPAS, Q.C., Sir HENRY THURSTON HOLLAND, Baronet, M.P., and Mr. ALFRED WALKER SIMPSON (recorder of Scarborough) have been elected Benchers of the Inner Temple.

Mr. GEORGE SHOLTO DOUGLAS MURRAY, barrister, has been appointed an Assistant Commissioner under the Endowed Schools Act. Mr. Murray was educated at Wadham College, Oxford, where he graduated second class in classics in 1866, and he was afterwards elected a senior student of Christ Church. He was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in November, 1875.

Mr. SYDNEY GEORGE RATCLIFF, solicitor (of the firm of Ratcliff & Son), of 32, New Broad-street, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oath in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

Mr. JOHN SCOTT, barrister, has been appointed European Vice-President of the International Court of Appeal in Egypt. Mr. Scott is a graduate of Pembroke College, Oxford, and he was called to the bar at the Inner Temple in Michaelmas Term, 1865. He formerly practised on the Northern Circuit.

Mr. JOHN KNOX WEATHERHEAD, solicitor (of the firm of Sanderson & Weatherhead), of Berwick-upon-Tweed, has been appointed a Perpetual Commissioner for taking the Acknowledgments of Deeds by Married Women for the County of Northumberland and the County and Town of Berwick-upon-Tweed.

COMPANIES.

WINDING-UP NOTICES.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

GLANTYRAFON IRON AND TINPLATE COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented Jan 21, directed to be heard before the M.R. on Feb 5. Bell and Co, Bow churchyard, agents for Linton and Kenshole, Aberdare, solicitors for the petitioner.

GERRINSON SLATE QUARRIES, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented Jan 24, directed to be heard before the V.C.M. on Feb 11. Chapman and Co, Lincoln's inn fields, solicitors for the petitioner.

HARTLEPOOL'S NEWSPAPER AND PRINTING COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented Jan 25, directed to be heard before the V.C.B. on Feb 5. Rowley and Co, Great Winchester st, bldgs, agents for Hall and Co, Manchester, solicitors for the petitioner.

HUGHES'S LOCOMOTIVE AND TRAMWAY ENGINE WORKS, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented Jan 24, directed to be heard before the V.C.M. on Feb 4. Webb, Queen Victoria st, solicitor for the petitioners.

H. A. BROWN AND COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented Jan 25, directed to be heard before the V.C.H. on Feb 11. Burns, Clement's lane, petitioner.

LONDON AERATED AND MINERAL WATERS COMPANY, LIMITED.—By an order made by the M.R. dated Jan 15 it was ordered that the company be wound up, and that William Aldridge, the provisional official liquidator, be continued till an official liquidator be appointed. Chinery and Co, Fenchurch st, solicitors for the petitioner.

TELEPHONE COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented Jan 22, directed to be heard before the M.R. on Feb 12. Linklater and Co, Wallbrook, solicitors for the petitioner.

[Gazette, Jan. 28.]

BIGWORTH COLLIERY COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up presented Jan 28, directed to be heard before the M.R. on Feb 12. Field and Co, Lincoln's inn fields, agents for Deane and Hands, Loughborough, solicitors for the petitioner.

CO-OPERATIVE FOUNDRY AND BUILDERS' SUPPLY AND ADVANCE ASSOCIATION, LIMITED.—The V.C.H. has by an order dated Dec 14 appointed John Oldfield Chadwick, Moorgate st, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required on or before Mar 1 to send their names and addresses and the particulars of their debts or claims to the above. Mar 17 at 2 is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

ECCLESHILL WORSTED MILL COMPANY, LIMITED.—By an order made by the M.R., dated Jan 22, it was ordered that the company be wound up. Paterson and Co, Lincoln's inn fields, agents for Gardiner and Jeffery, Bradford, solicitors for the petitioners.

EDISON TELEPHONE COMPANY OF LONDON, LIMITED.—By an order made by the M.R., dated Jan 22, it was ordered that the company be wound up. Freshfields and Williams, Bank bldgs, solicitors for the petitioner.

LONDON AERATED AND MINERAL WATERS COMPANY, LIMITED.—The M.R. has fixed Feb 10 at 12 as his chambers for the appointment of an official liquidator.

SANDERSON AND COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented Jan 31, directed to be heard before the V.C.M. on Feb 11. Layton and Jacques, Ely pl, agents for Whitley and Whitley, Huddersfield, and Craven and Sunderland, joint solicitors for the petitioners.

WILLIAM LEVETT AND COMPANY, LIMITED.—Creditors of the above named company are required, on or before Feb 24 to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims to James Worley, Leadenhall st, Mar 1 at 12 is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims.

[Gazette, Feb. 1.]

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

TOPSHAM, WOODBURY, AND LYMPSTONE WATERWORKS COMPANY.—The M.R. has by an order dated Dec 11 appointed Henry Brown, Westminster chambers, Victoria st, to be official liquidator. Creditors are required, on or before Feb 24, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to the above.

[Gazette, Jan. 28.]

STATUTES OF CORNWALL.

FORTESCUE (STANNAGWIS) NATIVE TIN, COPPER, SILVER, AND ARSENIC COMPANY, LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented Jan 24, directed to be heard before the Vice-Warden at the Prince's Hall, Truro, Feb 23 at 11. Affidavits intended to be used at the hearing in opposition to the petition must be filed at the registrar's office, Truro, on or before Feb 21, and notice thereof must at the same time be given to the petitioners, their solicitors, or their agents. Hodge and Co, Truro, agents for Paige and Co, Redruth, petitioners' solicitors.

[Gazette, Jan. 28.]

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES DISSOLVED.

FRIENDLY UNION BENEFIT SOCIETY, Southwark Chapel, Long-lane, Bermondsey. Jan 25

LOYAL FEEB LODGE OF ODD FELLOWS' FRIENDLY SOCIETY, Cornhill, Wolverhampton, Stafford. Jan 24

SOUTH DEVON, CORNWALL, AND WEST CORNWALL RAILWAYS' INCAPACITATED AND SUPERANNUATION FUND, Plymouth, Devon. Jan 24

SOUTH DEVON, CORNWALL, AND WEST CORNWALL RAILWAYS' PROVIDENT SOCIETY, Plymouth, Devon. Jan 24

[Gazette, Jan. 28.]

THE COUNCIL OF JUDGES.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE ACT, 1873.

MINUTES (presented to Parliament) of the proceedings of a Council of the Judges of the Supreme Court of Judicature, duly assembled at her Majesty's Palace of Westminster on the 27th day of November, 1880, pursuant to the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1873, section 75, and continued by adjournment on the 29th of the same month.

Present:—The Lord Chancellor (in the chair); the Master of the Rolls, Lord Justice James, Lord Justice Brett, Lord Justice Leach, Vice-Chancellor Bacon, Sir James Hannen, Mr. Justice Denman, Mr. Justice Field, Sir Robert Phillimore, Mr. Justice Hawkins, Mr. Justice Fry, Mr. Justice Bowen, Lord Coleridge, Lord Justice Baggallay, Lord Justice Cotton, Vice-Chancellor Malins, Vice-Chancellor Hall, Mr. Justice Grove, Mr. Baron Pollock, Mr. Justice Lindley, Mr. Justice Manisty, Mr. Justice Lopes, Mr. Justice Stephen, Mr. Justice Williams.

It was proposed by the Lord Chancellor:—That a report be humbly made and submitted to her Majesty by this Council of Judges, pursuant to the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1873, section 52, to the following effect:—(Postponed till after the consideration of the subsequent resolutions, and then carried without a division).

Moved by the Lord Chancellor:—(A.) That in the opinion of this Council of Judges it is expedient that the number of the divisions of her Majesty's High Court of Justice be reduced by the consolidation and union in one division of all the judges now attached respectively to the Queen's Bench Division, the Common Pleas Division, and the Exchequer Division.

To which an amendment was moved by Mr. Justice Lopes.

as follows:—That it is not desirable that the judges should vote on the resolutions of the Lord Chancellor until they have before them the entire scheme for the management of the business of the High Court incidental to the changes proposed by the resolutions.

Upon a division there voted for the amendment—Wm. Balliol Brett, E. Hawkins, George Denman, J. F. Stephen, James Hannen, H. Manisty, Henry C. Lopes.

And against it—Selborne, C., Coleridge, R. Baggallay, Robt. Lush, James Bacon, C. E. Pollock, Nathl. Lindley, Edw. Fry, Watkin Williams, G. Jessel, M.R., W. M. James, Henry Cotton, Richd. Malins, Charles Hall, William V. Field, Charles Bowen.

A division being taken upon the original resolution (A.), there voted for the resolution—Selborne, C., Coleridge, R. Baggallay, Henry Cotton, Richd. Malins, Charles Hall, William V. Field, Robert J. Phillimore, Charles Bowen, G. Jessel, M.R., W. M. James, Wm. Balliol Brett, Robt. Lush, James Bacon, C. E. Pollock, Nathl. Lindley, Edw. Fry, Watkin Williams.

And against it—James Hannen, George Denman, H. Hawkins, W. R. Grove, H. Manisty, Henry C. Lopes, J. F. Stephen.

The Lord Chancellor moved:—(B.) That the Lord Chief Justice of England be the president of the division to be so formed by such consolidation and union.—Agreed to without a division.

The Lord Chancellor moved:—(C.) That the division to be so formed be called the Queen's Bench Division.—Agreed to without a division.

The Lord Chancellor moved:—(D.) That all causes and matters which, at the time when any Order in Council for the purpose of carrying these recommendations into effect shall come into operation, may be pending in any of the three divisions to be so united and consolidated, be transferred to the Queen's Bench Division, to be so formed as aforesaid, and that all proceedings of every kind which may be then pending in any such causes or matters be continued, carried on, and completed in the Queen's Bench Division to be so formed as aforesaid, in the same manner in all respects as they would have been in the division to which they were previously assigned, if the same had not been united or consolidated with such other two divisions as aforesaid.—Agreed to without a division.

The Lord Chancellor moved:—(E.) That all matters or other proceedings which by or under the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1873, or any Act amending the same, or any rule or order made pursuant thereto, have been or are assigned to the Queen's Bench Division, the Common Pleas Division, and the Exchequer Division respectively of her Majesty's High Court of Justice, be, from and after the time when such Order in Council as aforesaid shall take effect, assigned to the Queen's Bench Division, to be formed by such consolidation and union as aforesaid.—Agreed to without a division.

The Lord Chancellor moved:—(F.) That the office of Lord Chief Baron being now vacant, that office be reduced to an equality with the offices of the other judges of her Majesty's High Court of Justice who are not *ex officio* judges of her Majesty's Court of Appeal, by the abolition of the rank and title of Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer, and of all other distinctions between the office of any judge who may be hereafter appointed to fill the place in the said High Court of Justice now vacant by the death of the late Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer and the offices of the other judges of the said High Court of Justice who are not *ex officio* judges of her Majesty's High Court of Appeal, and between the salary, pensions, and patronage attached to such office, and the salaries, pensions, and patronage of such other judges of the said High Court of Justice as aforesaid.

Upon a division there voted for the resolution:—Selborne, C., Coleridge, R. Baggallay, Henry Cotton, Richd. Malins, Charles Hall, C. E. Pollock, Nathl. Lindley, H. Hawkins, Edw. Fry, G. Jessel, M.R., W. M. James, Wm. Balliol Brett, Robt. Lush, James Bacon, W. R. Grove, William V. Field, Robert J. Phillimore, Henry C. Lopes, Charles Bowen.

And against it—James Hannen, H. Manisty, George Denman, J. F. Stephen, Watkin Williams.

Moved by the Lord Chancellor:—(G.) That upon the

vacancy in the office of Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, now about to take place by the promotion of the present Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas (of which her Majesty has been graciously pleased to approve) to the office of Lord Chief Justice of England, the office which will so become vacant be reduced to an equality with the offices of the other judges of her Majesty's High Court of Justice who are not *ex officio* judges of her Majesty's Court of Appeal, by the abolition of the rank and title of Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, and of all other distinctions between the office of any judge who may be hereafter appointed to fill the place in the said High Court of Justice now about to be vacated as aforesaid and the offices of the other judges of the said High Court of Justice who are not *ex officio* judges of her Majesty's Court of Appeal, and between the salary, pension, and patronage attached to such office, and the salaries, pensions, and patronage of such other judges of the said High Court of Justice as aforesaid.

Upon a division there voted for the resolution—Selborne, C., Coleridge, R. Baggallay, Henry Cotton, Richd. Malins, Charles Hall, C. E. Pollock, Nathl. Lindley, H. Hawkins, Edw. Fry, G. Jessel, M.R., W. M. James, Wm. Balliol Brett, Robt. Lush, James Bacon, W. R. Grove, William V. Field, Robert J. Phillimore, Henry C. Lopes, Charles Bowen.

And against it—James Hannen, H. Manisty, George Denman, J. F. Stephen, Watkin Williams.

The Lord Chancellor moved:—(H.) That it be humbly recommended by this Council of Judges to her Majesty that an Order in Council be made by her Majesty, if her Majesty shall so please, for the purpose of carrying this report, and the recommendations therein contained, into effect, in the manner provided for by the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1873, section 32.

Upon a division there voted for the resolution—Selborne, C., Coleridge, R. Baggallay, Henry Cotton, Richd. Malins, Charles Hall, William V. Field, Robert J. Phillimore, Charles Bowen, G. Jessel, M.R., W. M. James, Wm. Balliol Brett, Robt. Lush, James Bacon, C. E. Pollock, Nathl. Lindley, Edw. Fry, Watkin Williams.

And against it—James Hannen, George Denman, H. Hawkins, W. R. Grove, against so far only as relates to resolution A.; H. Manisty, Henry C. Lopes, J. F. Stephen.

The re-arrangement of the police-courts within the metropolitan district has been for some time under the consideration of the Home Secretary and his advisers, in order to meet the changes in the public requirements consequent on the increase of the population, the growth of new suburbs, and other circumstances. Primarily it has been represented that two new courts are much needed, one at the eastern extremity of London, either in Hackney or Stratford, and the other in the opposite direction, somewhere about Clapham Junction. It was thought that the great increase in the assessment of the metropolis would have supported these two additional courts, each with its staff of magistrates and clerks, but the sanction of the Home Office could not be obtained, and Sir James Ingham, the chief magistrate, and his colleagues have been further deliberating with a view of meeting the difficulty without increase of expenditure. The two new courts are deemed indispensable, and it is, therefore, now proposed that they shall be provided, the one at Hackney, partly to relieve the Thames and adjacent districts, and to absorb Stratford, which is at present under the county justices; the other at Clapham Junction for the service of the large and increasing locality beyond Lambeth, an arrangement also being contemplated to include in one or other of the southern districts the town of Croydon. To meet the cost of maintaining these two new courts, it is proposed to abolish three of the existing courts—Westminster, Southwark, and Greenwich—and establish one more new one in a central situation at Southwark-park. The business at Westminster and Southwark courts is represented as declining, and it is thought that the work may be transferred to Lambeth, Bow-street, and the new district at Southwark-park. This last-named district would include Deptford and Greenwich, and all the ground between Charlton and London-bridge. The Home Secretary has called for reports on the subject from the superintendents and inspectors of police.

CREDITORS' CLAIMS.

CREDITORS UNDER ESTATES IN CHANCERY.
LAST DAY OF PROOF.

BARKER CHARLES, Barnes, Market Gardener. Feb 18. Turner v Barker, M.R. Piosse, Old Jewry chambers
CLAGETT, CAROLINE, Abbey rd, St John's Wood. Mar 1. Clagett v Clayton, Lockwood v Clayton, V.C. Hall. Farrar and Farrar, Wardrobe pl. Doctors' commons
DENBIGH, GEORGE SHARP, Penzance. Feb 15. Couch v Denbigh, M.R. Milton, Penzance
DUNN, JOSEPH GOULDING, Nicholas passage, Lombard st, Refreshment House Keeper. Feb 18. Dunn v Dunn, M.R. Buxton, Abchurch lane
FORREST, JOSEPH, Latchford, Chester, Miller. Mar 1. Forrest v Balshaw, V.C. Hall. Kirkcousel, Warrington
MIDDLETON, JAMES ALBERT, Gravesend, Comedian. Feb 21. Rogers v Hannaford, V.C. Malins. Sharland, Gravesend
NEWMAN, THOMAS, Coventry, Stonemason. Feb 21. Cole v Arch, V.C. Hall. Goate, Coventry
SMITH, JOHN, Cooper's row, Licensed Victualler, Feb 28. Darke v Crossman, V.C. Hall. Frichard, Theobald's rd, Gray's inn
STOPPARD, JOSEPH, Danesmoor, Clay Cross, Derby, Yeoman. Feb 10. Shemwell v Stoppard, V.C. Malins. Black. Chesterfield
WILDE, EDWARD, Sandyford, Stafford, Farmer. Feb 19. Blakeman v Frichard, V.C. Malins. Robinson, Ecclesall
[Gazette, Jan. 21.]

GRIFFITHS, JOHN, Llanwelynelwy, Carmarthen, Farmer. Feb 12. Griffiths v Phillips, V.C. Bacon. Rees, Llanelly
HANCOCK, JOHN, Glasfhorne, Northampton, Farmer. Feb 24. Hancock v Hancock, M.R. Law, Stamford
HUDSON, WILLIAM, Brighton, Gent; JOHN HUDSON, Bedford row, Holborn, Surgeon; and MARY ANN HUNT, Hollywood rd, Fulham rd. Feb 25. Hudson v Barker, V.C. Malins. May, Golden sq, St James's
LANGSTAFF, ROBERT, Exelby, nr Bedale, York, Butcher. Feb 21. Lightfoot v Langstaff, V.C. Hall. Teale, Leyburn
ROOSE, MARGARET, Frouding, Amble, Anglessey. Feb 22. Evans v Williamson, M.R. Griffith, Holyhead
SADLER, JOHN, Shurlington, Gloucester, Farmer. Feb 26. Holliday v Sadler, V.C. Malins. Jessop, Cheltenham
WILLIAMS, EDWIN, Sun Music Hall, Knightsbridge, Licensed Victualler. Feb 22. Taylor v Williams, M.R. Wise, Bristol
[Gazette, Jan. 25.]

CREDITORS UNDER 22 & 23 VICT. CAP. 25.
LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

BARNETT, HENRY, Surbiton, Surrey, Founder. Feb 28. Ashby, Queen Victoria st
BOTTOMLEY, MARY, Huddersfield. March 1. Bottomley, Huddersfield
BRENNIN, MARTHA, Cirencester, Gloucester. Feb 15. Lawrence and Haygarth, Cirencester
CARR, ALICE, Lincolne, Bury, Lancashire. Feb 28. Grundy, Bury
CHALMERS, JOHN, Esq, ELIZABETH LOUISA CHALMERS, JOHN EDWARD CHALMERS, Esq, Albion rd, Hammersmith. March 31. Mason, Regent st
CUNNINGTON, JOSEPH, Great Stukeley, Huntingdon, Retired Farmer. March 1. Jennings and Co, Burton-on-Trent
DINHAM, SARAH, Wellington, Somerset. Feb 28. Hanbury and Co, New Broad st
HOOPER, ANNE ORFORD, Sudbury House, Harrow-on-the-Hill. Feb 10. Lingard and Newby, Manchester
HUGHES, ARTHUR HENRY, Mangotsfield, Gloucester, Gent. Feb 12. Batt, Bristol
MAXTED, HARRIET, Whitstable, Kent. Feb 21. Furley, Canterbury
NICKSON, MARY, Wrexham, Denbigh. Feb 1. Jones and Co, Liverpool
PERKINS, SAMUEL, Burslem, Stafford, Wine Merchant. Feb 11. Julian, Burslem
PAYNE, THOMAS, Bickenhill, Warwick, Commission Agent. Feb 28. Saunders and Bradbury
PORTER, LAWRENCE GUSTAVUS, Pickering, York, Gent. May 1. Bartlett and Atkinson, Liverpool
RACE, WILLIAM, Darton, York, Casterator. Feb 21. Tyas and Co, Barnsley
SCHOLLES, ROBERT, Bury, Lancaster, Plumber. Feb 16. Grundy, Bury
SENIOR, JONATHAN, Royston, York, Joiner. Feb 28. Tyas and Stokes, Joseph, Chesham, Bury, Lancaster, Braid Manufacturer. Feb 16. Grundy, Bury
SPENCER, LAWRENCE WILSON, Preston, Lancaster, Surgeon. March 1. Fryer, Preston
TINKER, MARY, Southport, Lancaster. April 7. Evans, Ashton-under-Lyne
WOLSTENHOLME, ESEA, Hanover st, Sheffield, Builder. Feb 10. Rodgers and Co, Sheffield
[Gazette, Jan. 18.]

AIRY, GEORGE SHERRBROOKE, Pau, France, Commander, H.M.'s Royal Navy. Feb 28. Johnsons, Austin Friars
BARROW, THOMAS, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Gent. Feb 23. Leadbitter and Co, Newcastle-on-Tyne
BARTLAM, CHARLES, Handsworth, Stafford, Licensed Victualler. March 7. Pointon, Birmingham
BENNETT, SAMUEL, Long Eaton, Derby, Gent. Feb 25. Black, Nottingham
CARR, ISAAC, Tiverton, Somerset, Esq. March 18. Moger, Bath

DAWTEL, ROBERT, Richmond rd, Shepherd's bush, Genl. Feb 17. Lound, Chancery lane
GREENING, WILLIAM AUGUSTINE, Bromsgrove, Worcester, Gent. May 7. Sanders, Bromsgrove
HARVEY, JOHN Castlesacre, Norfolk, Shopkeeper. March 26. Palmer, Swaffham
HEASLER, GEORGE, Great Hamwell, Hertford, Plumber. March 1. Foster, Ware
HILL, JOHN, Paulton, Somerset, Gent. Feb 22. Cox and Kiteon, Beaminster
JAMES, ELIZ, Piddington Grange, Northampton, Farmer. Feb 21. Becke and Green, Northampton
KEST, WILLIAM, Church rd, Tottenham, Gent. March 1. Emmet and Co, Bloomsbury sq
KLEIN, CARL EMMET, Dewsbury, York, Commission Agent. Feb 21. Watiss and Son, Dewsbury
LANE, WILLIAM, Russell sq, Esq. March 1. Munton and Morris, Queen Victoria st
NELL, THOMAS WILLIAM, Lincoln rd, Clapham. Feb 15. Lound, Chancery lane
PALEY, AXN, Outlands, nr Harrogate, York. Feb 20. Paley and Buckle, York
PARDOX, JAMES, Halifax, Mercantile Clerk. Feb 26. Broomhead and Co, Sheffield
PEARSON, WILLIAM, Tynemouth, Northumberland, Clothier. Apr 1. Joel, Newcastle-on-Tyne
PHILLIPS, HENRY PEARCE, Loughborough rd, Brixton, Esq. Apr 4. Fielder and Summer, Doctors' commons
POWELL, THOMAS, Finchbeck, Lincoln, Gent. Feb 22. Bonner and Calthrop, Spalding
SMITH, DANIEL, sen, Bury, Lancaster, Corn Merchant. Feb 28. Grundy, Bury
SMITH, MARTIN TUCKER, Upper Belgrave st, Esq. Feb 20. Freshfields and Williams, Bank bldgs
TAYLOR, WILLIAM, Nottingham, Gent. Feb 25. Black, Nottingham
[Gazette, Jan. 21.]

ABRAHAM, JANE, Gloucester gins, Hyde pk. March 1. Coburn and Young, Leadenhall st
ACTON, WILLIAM JOHN, Danes inn, Esq. March 1. Dunster, Cavendish sq
ATKINSON, THOMAS, Glenbrook, Victoria Mount, Oxtou, Gent. Feb 25. Bates and Bernard, Finsbury circus
BOOTH, OSABIAH, Goldenhill, Stafford, Gent. Feb 23. Llewellyn and Ackrill, Tunstall
BYROM, ROBERT, Delph, York, Woollen Manufacturer. March 7. Toy and Broadbent, Ashton-under-Lyne
CAPEL, LAURA STEPHENS, Freemantle, Southampton. Apr 1. Bassett and Co, Southampton
CHADWICK, WILLIAM, Pemberton, Lancaster, Gent. Feb 3. Wood, Wigton
COLLINS, MARY, Tillingham, Essex. March 10. Crick and Freeman, Maldon
DOBSON, LYDIA, York. Feb 12. Wood, Pontefract
FERGUSON, HUGH, Cavendish sq, Esq. March 4. Atwell, Old Broad st
GODDARD, WILLIAM GILBERT, Broad Chalke, Wilts, Esq. March 10. Wilson and Son, Salisbury
HEWITT, ROY, PHILIP, Binstead Rectory, Isle of Wight. March 31. Bates and Bernard, Finsbury circus
HILL, ROBERT, sen, Wisbech, Cambridge, Farmer. Feb 10. Welchman, Wisbech
INDERMAUR, JOHN, sen, Portland pl, Solicitor. Feb 25. Low, Wimpole st
JACKSON, FRANCES, Newtown, Carlisle. March 1. Bonilla, Carlisle
KENNEL, JOHN, Winkfield, Berks, out of business. Feb 15. Kempell, Winkfield
LAWSON, WILLIAM, Barnsley, York, Colliery Proprietor. April 12. Dobb and Co, Barnsley
LE BRETTON, FRANCIS, Sussex pl, Regent's pk. Minet and Co, New Broad st
LEFEVER, HENRY FRANCIS SHAW, Green st, Grosvenor sq. April 4. Farrer and Co, Lincoln's inn fields
LEWIS, GEORGE, Albany rd, Surrey, Furniture Dealer. Feb 21. Ross, Old Kent rd
LISLE, MORGAN ALEXANDER, Cardiff, Ironfounder. Apr 11. Jones and Morgan, Manchester
LOONEY, AMOS, Leicester, Silversmith. Feb 22. Miles, Leicester
LYMOND, MARY AXN, Guildford, Surrey, out of business. Feb 28. White, Guildford
MARSHALL, WILLIAM, Chesterfield, Derby, Farmer. March 1. Radfern, Chesterfield
MORRIS, WILLIAM, Burton-on-Trent, Fruiterer. March 31. Goodge, Burton-on-Trent
NICOLLS, ELLEN, New Vanbrugh terrace, Blackheath. March 1. Mrs. Williams, Blackheath
OLLERHEAD, MARY, Stony Croft, Lancaster. Feb 28. Avison and Morton, Liverpool
PAYNE, FREDERICK, Brownhills, nr Tunstall, Licensed Victualler. Feb 28. Llewellyn and Ackrill, Tunstall
RENS, SARAH, Canton, Cardiff. March 1. Morris and Son, Cardiff
RICHARDS, CATHERINE, Llanstephan, Carmarthen. March 1. Thomas and Browne, Carmarthen
SCUPHAM, JAMES, Fulsow, Lincoln, Gent. Feb 18. Allison and Allison, Lough
SHELDON, HARRIET, Wednesbury, Stafford. Feb 21. Seaman, Wednesbury
THOMAS, GEORGE, Mydram, Carmarthen, Shopkeeper. March 1. Thomas and Browne, Carmarthen
THOMSON, PETER, Holmes Chapel, Chester, Innkeeper. March 12. Latham and Rygott, Sandbach
WELDON, JEREMIAH, Chesapeake, Manufacturer. March 1. Waugh, Cuckfield
WEST, HENRY REGINALD, Harpenden, Hertford, M.D. Feb 21. Wood and White, Poultry
[Gazette, Jan. 25.]

LEGISLATION OF THE WEEK.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

JAN. 31.—BILL READ A SECOND TIME.

Rivers Conservancy and Floods Prevention.

FEB. 1.—BILLS READ A SECOND TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS—Boston Dock, Hancock's Patent, London City Lands (Thames Embankment), London City Tithes Act, 1879, Extension (St. Botolph Without, Aldgate), Lower Thames Valley Main Sewerage Board, Nar Valley Drainage, North Level and Nene Outfall, Penarth, Sully and Barry Railway, Sectional or Block Buildings Management, &c., Severn Navigation, Witham Drainage.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

JAN. 27.—BILLS READ A SECOND TIME.

Rivers Floods Prevention; Local Government (Boundaries).

BILL IN COMMITTEE.

Burial and Registration Acts (Doubts Removal) (passed through committee).

BILL READ A FIRST TIME.

Bill to amend the Licensing Act, 1872, so far as relates to the disqualification of justices by making the disqualification of justices who are retailers of intoxicating drink absolute within the districts specified in the Act (Mr. Pugh).

JULY 28.—BILL READ A THIRD TIME.

Judicial Committee.

BILL READ A FIRST TIME.

Bill for the limitation of actions for the recovery of small debts in England (Lord Randolph Churchill).

The prospectus of the "California" Gold Mine Company (Limited) has been issued. Capital £130,000, in shares of £1 each. Applications will be received for 87,000, the remainder being reserved as part payment to the vendor. The mine is situated in Nevada district, about one mile from Central City, one of the termini of the Colorado Central Railroad, and the prospectus states that the mine is in full work, with all the necessary plant, machinery, and appliances.

We regret to learn from the American legal journals that the Hon. Wm. Beach Lawrence is seriously ill from mental exertion.

SALES OF ENSUING WEEK.

Feb 9.—Messrs. BAXTER, PAYNE, & LEPPER, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold and Leasehold Properties (see advertisement, Jan. 29, p. 4).

Feb 9.—Messrs. HARVEY, DAVIDS, & MORRIS, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold Building Site (see advertisement, Jan. 22, p. 4).

Feb 10.—Messrs. C. C. & T. MOORE, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., Freehold, Copyhold, and Leasehold Estates (see advertisement, this week, p. 270.)

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTH.

POLK.—Jan. 18, at Madura, South India, the wife of Alexander E. Polk, barrister-at-law, of a daughter.

MARRIAGE.

SPACKMAN.—Fox.—Jan. 27, at Melbourne, Australia, William Henry Spackman, barrister-at-law, of Christchurch, New Zealand, to Adelaide Margaret, daughter of John Woodhams Fox, of Oak House, near Orpington, Kent.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, JAN. 29, 1881.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar. To Surrender in London.

Boundy, William, Leadenhall st, Metal Dealer. Pet Jan 25. Murray. Feb 11 at 11.
Hopton, William, St Mary's rd, Harlesden, Builder. Pet Jan 26. Brougham. Feb 8 at 11.
Middleton, William Henry, High st, Stoke Newington, Lead and Glass Merchant. Pet Jan 15. Hazlitt. Feb 9 at 12.30.
Sparks, Charles, Salisbury sq, Fleet st, Parchment Manufacturer. Pet Jan 28. Brougham. Feb 9 at 1.

To Surrender in the Country.

Hutchinson, James, Wolverhampton, Licensed Victualler. Pet Jan 24. Sanders. Wolverhampton, Feb 8 at 12.
Tunstall, Henry Thomas, Newport, Monmouth, Hairdresser. Pet Jan 25. Davis. Newport, Feb 9 at 11.

TUESDAY, FEB. 1, 1881.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar. To Surrender in London.

Drummond, Rt Hon George, Earl of Perth and Melfort, Queen's gt, South Kensington. Pet Jan 27. Hazlitt. Feb 16 at 11.30.
Panther, George, Melton rd, Herne hill, of no occupation. Pet Jan 27. Hazlitt. Feb 16 at 11.
Raymond, Thomas Edward, Marlborough rd, Dalston, Builder. Pet Jan 27. Hazlitt. Feb 16 at 12.
Snook, James, Sylvan cottage, Hornsey Rise, Builder. Pet Jan 25. Pepps. Feb 16 at 12.30.

To Surrender in the Country.

Bessey, Robert, Carlton Colville, Suffolk, El Fisherman. Pet Jan 23. Worledge. Gt Yarmouth, Feb 16 at 11.
Brown, George, Lancaster, Grocer. Pet Jan 29. Hulton. Preston, Feb 17 at 11.
Cohen, Solomon, Liverpool, Money Lender. Pet Jan 29. Cooper. Liverpool, Feb 14 at 12.
Evans, John, Ffosddu, nr Salem, Carmarthen, Farmer. Pet Jan 28. Lloyd. Carmarthen, Feb 14 at 1.30.
Hughes, Joseph Samuel, Higher Broughton, nr Manchester, out of business. Pet Jan 28. Hulton. Salford, Feb 16 at 11.
Sanders, Edward, Woburn, Bedford, Carrier. Pet Jan 28. Cooke. Laton, Feb 12 at 11.

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

FRIDAY, JAN. 29, 1881.

Hanlan, Felix White, Treforest, Glamorgan, Commission Agent. Jan 19.
Smith, Samuel, Charlton Horthorne, Somerset, Draper. Jan 13.
Webb, Beaver, Albemarle st. Jan 21.

TUESDAY, FEB. 1, 1881.

Brooks, Joseph Frederick, Wells, Somerset, Butcher. Jan 23.
Cook, Thomas Ansley, Gt Queen st, Vocalist. Jan 14.

Liquidations by Arrangement.

FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, JAN. 29, 1881.

Allen, Alfred George, Gunnersbury, Slate Merchant. Feb 9 at 2 at offices of Williams, King st, Cheapside.
Anderson, William, Durham, Chemist. Feb 14 at 12 at offices of Wright, John st, Sunderland.
Anderton, William Jones, Preston, Lancaster, Umbrella Manufacturer. Feb 10 at 3 at offices of Thompson and Craven, Lune st, Preston.
Andrew, James, Aston-under-Lyne, Horse Dealer. Feb 9 at 3 at offices of Hampson, Booth st chambers, Ashton-under-Lyne.
Ansell, James, Brick lane, Licensed Victualler. Feb 16 at 3 at offices of Shearer, Basinghall st. Procter and Andrews, Princes street, Spitalfields.
Aston, George William, High st, Notting hill, Builder. Feb 10 at 4 at offices of Yorke and Wharton, Conduit st, Bond st.
Atkinson, Thomas, Scarborough, York, Provision Dealer. Feb 7 at 3 at offices of Cornwall and Watts, Queen st, Scarborough.
Baker, George Robert, Wendling, Norfolk, Farmer. Feb 14 at 12 at offices of Wright and Co, East Dereham.
Baldwin, Howard, Old Newton, Suffolk, Farmer. Feb 21 at 11 at Fox Hotel, Stowmarket.
Baldwin, William, Kirkdale, York, Corn Miller. Feb 9 at 11 at offices of Harrison, Kirbymoorside.
Bayley, Edward, Shrewsbury, Salop, Baker. Feb 11 at 3 at offices of Clarke and Sons, Swan hill, Shrewsbury.
Bedford, Susan, Montague rd, Uxbridge Common, Grocer. Feb 18 at 2 at offices of Davis, Basinghall st.
Beston, Alfred, and John Hixley, Birmingham, Engineers. Feb 8 at 3 at offices of Jaques, Temple row, Birmingham.
Beverly, Sophia Louisa Banks, Notting hill ter, Notting hill, Professional Singer. Feb 9 at 2 at offices of Naser, Castle st, Holborn.
Bird, William, Cannonk, Stafford, Beerhouse Manager. Feb 7 at 3 at offices of Rhodes, Queen st, Wolverhampton.
Boys, Thomas, Lee, Kent, Greengrocer. Feb 15 at 3 at the Victoria House, Trinity st, Southwark. Borden and Co.

Brearley, William, Halifax, Dyer. Feb 9 at 11 at the Talbot Hotel.
 Woolshops, Halifax. Rhodes, Halifax
 Brigham, John, Holderness, York, Corn Merchant. Feb 8 at 3.30 at
 offices of Gregson, Exchange buildings, Bowllalley lane. Thorp
 and Firth, Kingston-upon-Hull
 Burr, John, Wootton, Bedford, Farmer. Feb 10 at 11 at the George
 Hotel, Bedford. Jessopp, Bedford
 Carley, David, Manchester, Fruit Salesman. Feb 18 at 3 at the Dog
 and Partridge Hotel, Corporation st, Manchester. Leyland, Man-
 chester
 Clarke, John, Palgrave, Scarborough, Innkeeper. Feb 4 at 3 at
 offices of Cornwall and Watts, Queen st, Scarborough
 Connell, John, Crowle, Lincoln, Butcher. Feb 8 at 4 at the Darby
 and Joan Hotel, Crowle. Pearson and Burtonshaw, Crowle
 Dalton, George Grubb, Middlesborough, Builder. Feb 8 at 11 at
 offices of Jackson and Jackson, Albert rd, Middlesborough
 Davies, David Myddin, Brynmawr, Brecon, Slate Merchant. Feb 9
 at 11 at offices of Powell, Brynmawr
 Davies, James Charles, Paradise st, Lambeth, Mathematical Scale
 Maker. Feb 11 at 12 at offices of Savage, Eastcheap
 Dodd, Thomas, Blaxwick, Stafford, Painter. Feb 9 at 12 at offices
 of Baker, Bridge st, Walsall
 Down, Albert, Glastonbury, Somerset, Brick Manufacturer. Feb 16
 at 12 at offices of Bath, Chilwell st, Glastonbury
 Doyle, George, Bernard Doyle, and John Doyle, Liverpool, Grocers.
 Feb 9 at 3 at offices of Horner, Stafford at, Liverpool
 Drew, Peter, Gloucester, Seedsman's Assistant. Feb 8 at 3 at offices
 of Tynant and Sons, Clarence st, Gloucester
 Dyer, James, Gt Grimsby, Lincoln, Fish Merchant. Feb 11 at 11 at
 offices of Grange and Winttingham, St Mary's chambers, West St
 Mary's gate, Gt Grimsby
 Edgcombe, John Gilbert, Bournemouth, Watchmaker. Feb 10 at
 11 at the Great Western Hotel, Snow hill, Birmingham. Trevanion
 Pooole
 Evans, Charles, Hyson green, Nottingham, Clothier. Feb 8 at 12 at
 offices of Wyles, Low pavement, Nottingham
 Evans, James, Barnsley, York, Grocer. Feb 15 at 11 at offices of
 Parker and Hickmott, Regent st, Barnsley
 Fairweather, Robert Hyne, Harbortonford, Devon, Brewer. Feb 8
 at 12 at offices of Square and Bridgeman, 44, George street, Ply-
 mouth
 Fridd, William, Bethersden, Kent, Farmer. Feb 11 at 11.30 at offices
 of Fraser, High st, Ashford
 Game, James, Leatherhead, Farmer. Feb 9 at 3 at 88 Aldersgate st.
 Houlders, Barbican
 Garton, John, Little Humby, Lincoln, Farmer. Feb 10 at 11.30 at
 Red Lion Ind, Grantham. Holdich, New Steadford
 Gayler, John, Wolverhampton, Book-keeper, out of employment.
 Feb 10 at 3 at offices of Rhodes, Queen st, Wolverhampton
 Geyelin, George Kennedy, Lyme st, Camden rd, Commercial Travel-
 ler. Feb 14 at 2 at offices Buchanan and Rogers, Basinghall st
 Gregory, Charles, jun, Swansea, Earthenware Dealer. Feb 9 at 11
 at offices of Thomas, York pl, Swansea
 Griffiths, James, Haverfordwest, Grocer. Feb 7 at 2 at offices of
 Jones, Victoria pl, Haverfordwest
 Gurney, Joseph John, Clevedon, Somersetshire, Grocer. Feb 9 at 2
 at offices of Ware, Shannon ct, Corn st, Bristol. Cossahm, Bristol
 Hall, Edward, Chesterfield, Derby, Beerhouse Keeper. Feb 11 at 3
 at offices of Gee, High st, Chesterfield
 Hall, Edwin, Newcastle-under-Lyne, Builder. Feb 5 at 3 at offices
 of James, Nelson sq, Newcastle-under-Lyne
 Hancock, Edwin, Workop, Nottingham, Timber Merchant. Feb 14
 at 3 at offices of Webster and Styling, Harthead, Sheffield
 Hedges, Ernest, Littlefield rd, Grove rd, Coal Merchant. Feb 7 at 3
 at offices of Groom, New Broad st. Cattlin, Wormwood st, Broad at
 Heywood, Walter, Winkleigh, Devon, Farmer. Feb 11 at 12 at offices
 of Thorne, Castle st, Barnstaple
 Hobbs, William, Kingston-upon-Hull, Watchmaker. Feb 8 at 3 at
 offices of Lambert, Bowllalley lane, Kingston-upon-Hull
 Hopkinson, William Henry, Bradford, York, Ironfounder. Feb 7 at
 11 at offices of Peel and Co, Chapel lane, Bradford
 Hornby, Joseph, Brigham, York, Farmer. Feb 9 at 3 at offices of
 Jennings and Co, Great Driffield
 Hosason, Maria Murray, Beckenham, Kent, Governess. Feb 10 at
 12 at offices of Cutler and Co, King st, St James's
 Hull, James, Manchester, Architect. Feb 8 at 3 at offices of Fox,
 Princess st, Manchester
 Jagger, William, Heckmondwike, York, Confectioner. Feb 10 at 3
 at offices of Sykes, Heckmondwike
 Jennings, James, Victor rd, Harrow rd, Cowkeeper. Feb 5 at 3 at
 offices of Johnson, Seymour pl, Marylebone
 Johnson, James Thos, Bowley Regis, Stafford, Timber Merchant.
 Feb 9 at 13 at offices of Griffin and Griffin, Cherry st, Birming-
 ham
 Jones, Owen, Cardiff, Grocer. Feb 11 at 12 at offices of Morgan and
 Scott, High st, Cardiff
 Kay, William, Pendleton, Lancaster, Plumber. Feb 7 at 11 at offices
 of White, King st, Manchester
 Kenning, George, Bedford, Confectioner. Feb 8 at 11 at Clarence
 Hotel, St John's, at, Bedford. Nicholson, Bedford
 Klein, Christian, Rochester row, Westminster, Baker. Feb 17 at 2
 at offices of Brown, Basinghall st
 Lake, William George, Shinfield, Berks, Innkeeper. Feb 7 at 11 at
 offices of Newnham, Friar st, Reading
 Lain, Albert, and Walter Lain, Norwich, Boot Manufacturers. Feb
 10 at 3.30 at offices of Simpson and Palmer, Three Crown sq, Boro
 High st, Kent, Norwich
 Lazarus, Morris, Draper st, Walworth, Butcher. Feb 4 at 10 at
 offices of Micklethwait and Co, Long Acre
 Little, William, Willoughton Grange, Lincoln, Farmer. Feb 9 at 11
 at offices of Oldman and Iveson, Lord st, Gainsborough
 Littlewood, Frederick Adolphus, Victoria rd, Surbiton, Oilman.
 Feb 17 at 3 at offices of Bradley, Mark lane
 Malkin, George, Newcastle-under-Lyne, Carter. Feb 5 at 3 at offices
 of James, Nelson sq, Newcastle-under-Lyne
 Massey, Joseph, Desford, Leicester, Farmer. Feb 11 at 3 at offices
 of Wright, Belvoir st, Leicester

Maycock, John, and John Maycock, jun, Lowther arcade, West
 Strand, Glass and China Dealers. Feb 17 at 3 at offices of Monop,
 Cannon st
 McKeeth, John, Frederick, Sunderland, Provision Merchant. Feb
 9 at 11 at offices of Edington, High st West, Sunderland. Robin-
 son, Sunderland
 Melton, Henry, Chatham, Carver and Gilder. Feb 14 at 3 at King's
 Head Hotel, High st, Rochester. Shakespear, Southamton bldgs,
 Chancery lane
 Millward, Abraham, jun, West Bromwich, Stafford, Tobaccoconist.
 Feb 8 at 11 at offices of Forrest, Church st, Oldbury
 Mordcaai, Thomas, Llantrissant, Glamorgan, Quarryman. Feb 12
 at 12 at offices of Hoitler and Williams, Pannel sq, Pontypridd
 Myers, Henry Myer, Bishopgate st Without, Publisher. Feb 15 at
 2 at offices of Michael, Great Winchester st
 Newhouse, Henry Lewis Titus Gt Tower st, Wine and Spirit Agent,
 Feb 8 at 2 at offices of Mass, Wincoster House Old Broad st
 Nixey, Walter John, Barnsdale rd, Harrow rd, Stone Mason. Feb 5
 at 12.15 at offices of Bell, Bishopgate st, Without
 Oliver, William, Malcombe Regis, Dorset, Innkeeper. Feb 10 at 3
 at Queen's Hotel, Weymouth. Hamne, Weymouth
 Biggott, Joseph, Shocklach, Chester, Farm Bailiff. Feb 8 at 2 at
 Crown Hotel, Nantwich. Edwards, Shrewsbury
 Politzer, Ferdinand, Ely-place, Holborn, Commission Agent.
 Feb 14 at 3 at offices of Pritchard and Co, Painters' Hall, Little
 Trinity-lane
 Powell, Thomas, and Charles Thomas Powell, Abergavenny, Man-
 mouth, Painters. Feb 12 at 1 at offices of Brown, Lion st,
 Abergavenny
 Prodders, Thomas Charles, Brighton, Coal Dealer. Feb 14 at 1 at
 offices of Mills, New rd, Brighton
 Reed, Jeremiah, Billinghamhurst, Sussex, Grocer. Feb 11 at 3 at
 offices of Medwin and Co, Horsham
 Richards, Robert Stephens, Mountain Ash, nr Aberdare, Draper.
 Feb 7 at 10.15 at Queen's Hotel, Aberdare. Howells, Aberdare
 Richardson, George, Stockton-upon-Tees, Farmer. Feb 9 at 3 at
 offices of Tweedy, High st, Stockton-upon-Tees
 Riley, Edwin, Leamington, Warwick, Boot Manufacturer. Feb 10
 at 3 at offices of Wright and Hassell, Dornier pl, Leamington
 Roskell, William, Barrow-in-Furness, Grocer. Feb 9 at 11 at Ship
 Hotel, Barrow-in-Furness. Bradshaw, Barrow-in-Furness
 St John, Joseph William, Kingston-upon-Thames, Builder. Feb 10 at
 2 at the Inns of Court Hotel, Holborn. Swann and Co, Chancery
 lane
 Baker, Sydney, Strathmore rd, Croydon, Brick Merchant. Feb 19
 at 2 at offices of Hogan and Hughes, Martin's lane, Cannon st
 Savage, Robert Hannathon, Altraham, Cheshire, Grocer. Feb 17
 at 2 at offices of Cooke, Temple chambers, Oak st, Crews
 Sayer, Alban, Great Ellingham, Norfolk, Farming Bailiff. Feb 11
 at 2 at offices of Gregson and Robinson, Watton. Robinson
 Scott, William James, Birmingham, out of business. Feb 11 at 12
 at offices of Tyndall and Co, Waterloo st, Birmingham
 Short, William Hooper, Walsingham-le-Willows, Suffolk, Physician.
 Feb 15 at 12 at offices of Salmon and Son, the Guildhall, Bury St
 Edmunds
 Smith, George, Moss Side, Manchester, Fishmonger. Feb 8 at 3 at
 offices of Heywood and Son, Mount st, Albert sq, Manchester
 Smith, John, Diglis, Worcester, Coal Dealer. Feb 10 at 11 at offices
 of Tree and Son, High st, Worcester
 Smith, Richard William, Bristol, Printer. Feb 9 at 12.30 at offices
 of Collins, Broad st, Bristol. Clifton and Carter, Bristol
 Smith, William, Birkenhead, Cheshire, Tailor. Feb 10 at 3 at offices
 of Moore, Duncan st, Birkenhead
 Smith, William, Bewdley, Worcester, Licensed Victualler. Feb 11
 at 3 at the Peacock Inn, Lower Park. Hemmings, Bewdley
 Stabb, John, Praed st, Paddington, Builder. Feb 12 at 3 at offices
 of Montagu and Co, Gray's inn sq
 Storey, George, Crowle, Lincoln, Flax Merchant. Feb 8 at 2 at
 the Derby and Joan Hotel, Crowle. Pearson and Burtonshaw,
 Crowle
 Stovold, James, High st, Hampton, Ironmonger. Feb 15 at 1 at
 offices of Watson, Southampton bldgs, Chancery lane
 Sutcliffe, John, Halifax, Dyer. Feb 9 at 12 at the Talbot Hotel,
 Woolshops, Halifax. Rhodes, Halifax
 Tame, Alfred, Devonshire terrace, Notting hill, out of business,
 Feb 8 at 11 at offices of Watson, Southampton bldgs, Chancery
 lane
 Trigg, David, Parsonage walk, Newington Butts, Police Constable.
 Feb 6 at 2 at offices of Harris, Borough High st, Southwark
 Turner, Tim Wadsworth, and Thomas Hirst, Dewsbury, York
 Contractors. Feb 10 at 2 at the Wellington Hotel, Dewsbury.
 Shaw, Dewsbury
 Underwood, James Alfred, Bristol, Grocer. Feb 10 at 11 at offices
 of Ward, Albion chmrs, Bristol
 Walter, Thomas, New Charlton, Kent, Baker. Feb 10 at 12 at 38,
 Green's End, Woolwich. Hughes, Gresham bldgs
 Ward, Robert Harvey, Boston, Lincoln, Farmer. Feb 10 at 11 at
 offices of Rice and Co, Main Ridge, Boston
 Watkin, Henry, Crews, Chester, Shoosmith. Feb 11 at 11 at
 Albert chambers, Churchside, Crews. Poinson, Crews
 Wild, William, Newcastle-under-Lyne, Beerhouse Keeper. Feb 6
 at 3 at offices of James, Nelson sq, Newcastle-under-Lyne
 Wilkinson, Thomas, Ardleigh, Essex, Grocer. Feb 16 at 12 at
 the Fleece Inn, Head st, Colchester. Pollard, Ipswich
 Williams, John, Llandwrog, Carnarvon, shopkeeper. Feb 8 2.30
 at offices of Hayward, Market st, Carnarvon
 Written, Robert Edward, Sittingbourne, Kent, Baker. Feb 15 at 11
 at offices of Gibson, High st, Sittingbourne
 Wright, Henry, Ashwin st, Dalton, Turkish Bath Proprietor. Feb
 10 at 3 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st
 Wright, William Johnson, Delaford rd, Rotherhithe New rd, Car-
 penter. Feb 5 at 1 at the Mason's Hotel Tavern, Mason's avenue,
 Basinghall st. Fenilide, New Court chambers, Carey st

TUESDAY, Feb. 1, 1881.

Adams, Walter, Birmingham, Licensed Victualler. Feb 11 at 3 at
 offices of Fallows, Cherry st, Birmingham
 Andrew, Joseph, Swansea, Ironmonger. Feb 16 at 3 at offices of
 Tribe and Co, Albion chambers, Small st, Bristol. Brown and Co,

- Asplet, Georges Cesar, Frome, Somerset, Teacher of French. Feb 14 at 3 at offices of Dunn and Payne, King st, Frome
- Backhouse, Noah Ite, Lewisham, Kent, Ironmonger. Feb 15 at 3 at offices of Broad and Co, Queen st, Champside. Tickle, Lawrence lane, Champside
- Barnstable, Frederick, New Swindon, Wilts, Corn Merchant. Feb 17 at 3 at offices of Boodle, Albion bldgs, New Swindon
- Barrett, George, Marmion ter, Lavender hill, Hatter. Feb 11 at 2 at offices of Chester and Co, Staple inn, Holborn
- Bates, Edmund Oscar, Leicester, Builder. Feb 16 at 3 at offices of Hincks, Bowling Green st, Leicester
- Bates, Henry, Dartmouth villas, Seven Sisters' rd, Builder. Feb 7 at 12 at offices of Medcalf, King st, Champside
- Baynes, Peter, and William Baynes, Knaresborough, York, Grocers. Feb 11 at 12 at the People's Hotel, Albert st, Harrogate. Kirby & Son, Knaresborough
- Blair, Samuel, and Edward Birks, Leighton Buzzard, Bedford, Manufacturers of Appliances for Rearing Poultry. Feb 16 at 3 at the Swan Hotel, Leighton Buzzard. Willis, Leighton Buzzard
- Bland, William Charles, Scarborough, Innkeeper. Feb 14 at 12 at offices of Calvert and Fowler, Westborough, Scarborough
- Bough, Edward, Morton, Derby, Grocer. Feb 15 at 3 at offices of Gee, High st, Chesterfield
- Brackenbury, James, Harrington, Lincoln, Farmer. Feb 14 at 3.30 at offices of Walker and Sons, Spilsby
- Bridgman, William Somersham, Huntingdon, Farmer. Feb 16 at 11.30 at Unicorn Hotel, St Ives
- Brook, James Andrew, Strand, Publisher. Feb 11 at 2 at offices of Hilbery, Billter st
- Brough, Thomas, Scarborough, Boot and Shoe Maker. Feb 14 at 3 at offices of Taylor, Queen st, Scarborough
- Brown, Noah, New Basford, Nottingham, out of business. Feb 16 at 3 at offices of Whittingham, Middle pavement, Nottingham
- Burgess, Frederic Shaw, Liverpool, Grocer. Feb 18 at 2 at offices of Sheen, North John st, Liverpool. Lyon and Reynolds, Liverpool
- Butcher, John Thomas, Charlham Hatch, Kent, Fruiterer. Feb 16 at 12 at offices of Collard, Castle st, Canterbury
- Butlin, Thomas, Stamford, Lincoln, Brush Maker. Feb 14 at 3 at offices of Stapleton, Saint Paul's st, Stamford
- Bull, Thomas, Church terrace, South Hackney, out of business. Feb 15 at 2 at Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st, Furse Neave, Champside
- Challis, Alfred John, Fulham rd, Licensed Victualler. Feb 14 at 2 at offices of Andrews and Mason, Ironmonger lane. Bartrum, Old Jewry chambers
- Chapman De Louth, Rairebecke Le Clair Restall De Louth, Edgware rd, Grocer. Feb 15 at 2 at Inns of Court Hotel, Lincoln's inn Fields. Mould, Carey st, Chancery lane
- Charlton, Samuel, Nunney, Somerset, Baker. Feb 16 at 3 at offices of Ames, Cork st, Frome
- Clegg, Charles, Bradford, York, Confectioner. Feb 14 at 11 at offices of Walslaw, Crown st chmbrs, Halifax
- Clough, Edwin, and Ezra Clough, Bradford, Coal Merchants. Feb 14 at 3 at offices of Richardson and Morris, Swan arcade, Bradford
- Coleman, George, Gateshead, Durham, Fruit Merchant. Feb 11 at 3 at Traders' Association, Grainger st West, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
- Brown, Jun, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
- Coleman, Richard Thomas, Exton, Rutland, Farmer. Feb 16 at 10 at offices of Law, St Mary's pl, Stamford
- Cooper, Henry, and John Norman, Carlisle, Grocers. Feb 17 at 3 at offices of Errington, Bank st, Carlisle
- Cowell, Frederick, Kidderminster, Worcester, Coal Merchant. Feb 15 at 3 at offices of Roden and Dawes, Bank bldings, Kidderminster
- Coxon, William Henry, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, out of business. Feb 15 at 11.30 at offices of Clark, Grainger st West, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
- Crawley, James, Devonshire terrace, Turnham green, Ironmonger. Feb 16 at 3 at offices of Ives, King street West, Hammersmith
- Cross, Arthur William, Kingston, Surrey, Grocer. Feb 17 at 2 at offices of Richardson, Bucklersbury
- Cumiliffe, Samuel, and George Taylor, Bolton, Lancashire, Lard Refiners. Feb 15 at 3 at Mitre Inn, Cathedral gates, Manchester
- Mawdsley and Hughes, Bolton
- Davis, Henry, Ashby-de-la-Zouch, Farmer. Feb 10 at 11 at offices of Fisher and Co, Ashby-de-la-Zouch
- Dickinson, John, Lincoln, Innkeeper. Feb 15 at 11 at offices of Harrison, Bank st, Lincoln
- Ditchfield, William, Blackburn, Public Accountant. Feb 15 at 11 at offices of Fletcher, Holme st, Blackburn
- Down, Henry, Deptford, Kent, Baker. Feb 10 at 2 at offices of Norris, Southampton bldgs, Chancery lane
- Elliott, William, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Innkeeper. Feb 11 at 2 at offices of Dove, Post office chambers, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
- Franklin, Charles, Queen's rd, Wimbledon, Hatter. Feb 11 at 2 at offices of Chester and Co, Staple inn, Holborn
- Freshney, Alfred, Leeds, Hoaler. Feb 14 at 3 at offices of Nelson and Co, Gt Northern Railway Station, King's Cross
- Goldberg, Jacob, Sunderland, Durham, Boot and Shoe Dealer. Feb 14 at 3 at offices of Dixon and Barker, Bank chmbrs, Bedford st, Sunderland
- Goodall, John William, Manchester, Fruit Salesman. Feb 14 at 3 at offices of Tremwren, Ward's bldings, Deansgate, Manchester
- Groark, Thomas, Warrington, Beerhouse Manager. Feb 14 at 10 at offices of Pike, Sankey st, Warrington
- Haley, Ann, Huddersfield, Dress Maker. Feb 14 at 11 at offices of Craven and Sunderland, New st, Huddersfield
- Harden, Charles Wood, Hollingbourne, Kent, Farmer. Feb 17 at 12.30 at the Bull Inn, Gabriel's hill, Maidstone. Ellis, Maidstone
- Harding, Joseph, Dover Haddridge, Burslem, Boreseller. Feb 12 at 11 at offices of Ellis, Market pl, Burslem
- Phillip, Right Hon Charles, Earl of Hardwicke, Wimpole Hall, Cambridge. Feb 24 at 3 at offices of Lumley and Lumley, Conduit st, Bond st
- Hardy, William, Great Steeping, Lincoln, Farmer. Feb 12 at 10 at offices of Thimbleby and Son, Spilsby
- Harvey, Frederick Charles, Snow's fields, Southwark, Grocer. Feb 24 at 3 at offices of Howard, Southampton bldgs, Chancery lane
- Hayes, Thomas, Ilminster, Somerset, Book Maker. Feb 15 at 11 at offices of Paul, Court Barton, Ilminster
- Henshaw, Richard, The Terrace, Enfield Highway, Builder. Feb 8 at 2 at Masons' Hall Tavern, Masons' avenue. Rawlings, Walbrook
- Hollanders, Emil, Portsea, Watch Maker. Feb 15 at 4 at offices of King, North st, Portsea
- Houghton, Thomas, Rochdale, Machine Maker. Feb 14 at 3 at office of Wiles, Acker st chmbrs, Acker st, Rochdale
- How, William, Flimstad, Hartford, Farmer. Feb 8 at 2 at Swan Inn, Markyate st, Bedford. Wells, St Albans
- Humblestone, Clement George Gommom, High rd, Tottenham, Butcher. Feb 14 at 3 at offices of Kumney, Walbrook
- Imison, Francis George, Dishforth, York, Butcher. Feb 14 at 12 at offices of Bateson and Hutchinson, Harrogate
- Ineson, William, Batley, York, Grocer. Feb 14 at 2 at offices of Booth and Sons, Hanover st, Batley. Waits and Son, Batley
- Jackson, Thomas Dean, Liverpool, Merchant. Feb 17 at 2 at 14, Cook st, Liverpool. Forshaw and Hawkins, Liverpool
- Jedell, William, South Shields, Licensed Victualler. Feb 16 at 2 at offices of Dale, King st, South Shields
- Jenkins, John, Llanelly, Carmarthen, Grocer. Feb 15 at 12 at offices of John, Fisher st, Swansea
- Johnson, Frederick, Leicester, Auctioneer. Feb 15 at 4 at offices of Hincks, Bowling Green lane, Leicester
- Keen, George Albert, Woodbridge, Suffolk, Licensed Victualler. Feb 15 at 12.30 at offices of Jackman and Sons, Silent st, Ipswich
- King, Samuel, Gray's inn rd, Church Decorator. Feb 16 at 3 at offices of Collins and Wilkinson, King William st
- Langford, Arthur, Birmingham, Tinplate Worker. Feb 14 at 3 at offices of Jaques, Temple row, Birmingham
- Lawson, Thomas, Wigan, Lancaster, Shopkeeper. Feb 15 at 11 at offices of Byrom and Bell, King st, Wigan
- Lee, Thomas, Daleview rd, Stamford hill, Builder. Feb 7 at 2 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Cheston and Sons Great Winchester st
- Lloyd, William, Kidderminster, Worcester, Market Gardens. Feb 14 at 3 at offices of Roden and Dawes, Bank buildings, Kidderminster
- Lowrie, William Andrew, Cardiff, Licensed Victualler. Feb 15 at 12 at offices of Stephenson and Co, Queen's chmbrs, Cardiff. Morris and Son, Cardiff
- Madeley, James, Nantwich, Chester, Builder. Feb 22 at 11 at Lamb Hotel, Nantwich. Lisle, Nantwich
- Malsbury, John William, Sulgrave, Northampton, Farmer. Feb 12 at 11 at White Lion Hotel, Banbury. Pain and Hawtin, Banbury
- Malvern, Frederic Charles, Cheltenham, Brushmaker. Feb 14 at 3 at offices of Stroud, Clarence parade, Cheltenham
- Marsh, Alfred, Newport, Monmouth, Provision Merchant. Feb 11 at 12 at offices of Collins, Broad st, Bristol. Vaughan, Newport
- Ma-sey, Samuel, Grappenhall, Chester, Farm Labourer. Feb 4 at 10.30 at 5, Myr, Grappenhall
- Medley, Robert, Ventnor, Isle of Wight, Printer. Feb 17 at 1 at offices of Needham, New inn. Hamilton and Co
- Merington, John Mabbs, Rettenham, Essex, Farmer. Feb 16 at 1 at Saracens Head Hotel, Chelmsford. Woodward, Chelmsford
- Middleley, James, Barnsley, York, Innkeeper. Feb 17 at 11 at offices of Marshall and Owensworth, Church st, Barnsley
- Mousley, William Thorp, Shirley, Warwick, Farmer. Feb 11 at 10.15 at offices of East, Temple st, Birmingham
- Musgrave, John, and Joseph Meek Musgrave, Leeds, Cloth Manufacturers. Feb 14 at 2 at offices of Harrison, East parade, Leeds
- Myton, Ebenezer, Birmingham, Painter and Glazier. Feb 11 at 2 at offices of Burton, Union passage, Birmingham
- Newson, William, Chapman, Dewsbury, York, Saddler. Feb 15 at 10.15 at offices of Scholes and Son, Leeds rd, Dewsbury
- Nobbs, Charles William, Aldermanbury, Basket Importer. Feb 15 at 2 at offices of Greening, Fenchurch st
- Norton, George Seymour, Lea, Kent, Ironmonger. Feb 14 at 2 at offices of Tilley and Soames, Finsbury pavement
- Parry, John, Aberystwyth, Cardigan, Boot Manufacturer. Feb 9 at offices of Collins, Bristol, in lieu of the place originally named
- Plevy, Richard, Edward, Bewdley, Worcester, Saddler. Feb 12 at 1.30 of Mr. Beale, Commercial Sale Rooms, Kidderminster
- Hemingway, Bewdley
- Prole, James, Leicester, Baker. Feb 14 at 3 at offices of Wright, Belvoir st, Leicester
- Pratt, Edward, West Lynn St Peter, Norfolk, Farmer. Feb 14 at 12 at offices of Coulton and Son, Athenaeum, King's Lynn
- Pratt, Jones, South Repps, Norfolk, Farmer. Feb 19 at 1 at offices of Rackham, St Gile's st, Norwich
- Preston, Martin, Mickletholpe, York, Joiner. Feb 14 at 4 at offices of Atkinson and Wilson, Tyndal st, Bradford
- Prior, Charles, Bristol, Builder. Feb 10 at 12 at the Old Post Office chmbrs, Corn st, Bristol. Murly and Co
- Pritchard, William Henry, Congleton, Chester, Grocer. Feb 15 at 11 at the Lion and Swan Hotel, West st, Congleton. Garaid and Spencer
- Quiller, Henry George, Birchfield, Stafford, out of business. Feb 11 at 3 at Queen's Hotel, Stephenson pl, Birmingham. Johnson and Co, Birmingham
- Reeves, William, West Bromwich, Stafford, Blacksmith. Feb 15 at 11 at offices of Jackson and Sharpe, High st, West Bromwich
- Rich, George, Bristol, Timber Haulier. Feb 15 at 2 at offices of Hobbs, Clare st, Bristol
- Richardson, John Thomas, Birmingham, Coal Dealer. Feb 9 at 3 at offices of Ratcliff, Bennet's hill, Birmingham
- Ridgely, Alfred, Birmingham, Grocer. Feb 10 at 11 at offices of Peet, Newhall st, Birmingham
- Roberts, David, Festinlog, Merioneth, Builder. Feb 16 at 1 at Queen's Hotel, Four Crosses. Ellis, Four Crosses
- Robins, John, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Boot and Shoe Maker. Feb 14 at 2 at offices of Brewis and Co, Royal arcade, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
- Robinson, Joseph, Wakefield, York, Ironmonger. Feb 14 at 10 at offices of Lake and Lake, Southgate, Wakefield

Rogers, William, sen, Chesbunt, Hertford, out of business. Feb 9 at 3.30 at offices of Rumney, Walbrook
 Rooke, George, Cambridge, Butcher. Feb 23 at 12 at offices of Lyon, St Andrew's st, Cambridge
 Ryecroft, Charles James, Leeds, Grocer. Feb 14 at 3 at offices of Dal Albon st, Leeds
 Saunders, Daniel, Liverpool, Theatrical Proprietor. Feb 14 at 3 at 14, Cook st, Liverpool. Barrell and Co.
 Senior, Thomas Paret, Batley, Draper. Feb 15 at 2 at offices of Booth and Sons, Hanover st, Batley. Watts and Son, Batley
 Shemilt, John, Caverswall, Stafford, Farmer. Feb 9 at 11 at offices of Tennant and Co, Cheapside, Hanley
 Shepherd, Aaron, Great Horton, nr Bradford, Dyer. Feb 14 at 3 at offices of Killick and Co, Commercial Bank bldgs Bradford
 Simmonds, Edmond, Worcester, Builder. Feb 11 at 12 at offices of Roberts, High st, Worcester
 Smith, Francis Smallman, Stourbridge, Worcester, Architect. Feb 12 at 11 at offices of Price, High st, Stourbridge
 Stephens, John, St Blazey, Cornwall, Boot Maker. Feb 11 at 11 at offices of Carlyon and Stephens, Cross lane, St Austell
 Stephens, Joseph, Peterborough, Stone Mason. Feb 14 at 11 at office of Hart, Priestgate, Peterborough
 Stephens, Richard, Kingston, Hereford, Grocer. Feb 15 at 2 at offices of Cheese and Delfosse, Brigg st, Kingston
 Soddiart, Granger, Sunderland, Durham, Tea Dealer. Feb 11 at 11 at offices of Robinson, West Sunnside, Sunderland
 Sutherland, Eric, Berkeley sq, Farmer. Feb 9 at 2 at Lombard House, George yd, Lombard st. Vallance and Vallance, Essex st, Strand
 Swain, Samuel, West Hartlepool, Durham, Builder. Feb 17 at 3 at the Jackson Arms Hotel, Tower st, West Hartlepool
 Swash, John Evan, Neath, Glamorgan, Boot Maker. Feb 18 at 11 at offices of Scale, Orchard pl, Neath
 Swindells, Charles, Heaton Norris, Lancaster, Coal Dealer. Feb 15 at 10.30 at offices of Brown and Ainsworth, St Peter's gate, Stockport
 Tedman, Joseph, Shipton st, Hackney rd, Chair Manufacturer. Feb 17 at 3 at offices of Taylor and Jaquet, South st, Finsbury sq
 Thomas, William, St John's st, Clerkenwell, Clock Importer. Feb 11 at 3 at offices of Wetherfield, Gresham buildings, Guildhall
 Thomas, Thomas, Wern, Carmarthen, Licensed Victualler. Feb 12 at 11 at offices of Howell, Steyne st, Llanelli
 Turner, Edwin, Wakefield, York, Provision Dealer. Feb 14 at 3 at offices of Lodge, Townhall chambers, King st, Wakefield
 Upton, Job, Crackley, Kenilworth, Warwick, Farmer. Feb 14 at 12 at offices of Sanderson, Church st, Warwick
 Vickers, Richard, Manchester, General Dealer. Feb 14 at 12 at offices of Jones, Mosley st, Manchester. Minor, Manchester
 Waring, Samuel Thomas, Plymouth, Fruiterer. Feb 15 at 12 at offices of Rooker and Co, Frankfort st, Plymouth
 Watts, George Frederick, and David Davies, Foots Cray, Kent, Builders. Feb 14 at 11 at offices of Cullen and Wiggins, Vigo st, Regent st. Bilney, Salisbury sq
 Way, James Joseph, Bristol, Cork Cutter. Feb 10 at 2 at offices of Benson and Carpenter, Bank chambers, Corn st
 Wilcockson, William Robert, Kingston-upon-Hull, Butcher. Feb 15 at 3 at offices of Martinson, Exchange bldgs, Bowalley lane, Kingston-upon-Hull
 Williamson, John Henry, Manchester, Tea Merchants. Feb 16 at 3 at offices of Gardner, Cooper st, Manchester
 Winter Mary Ann, and Thomas Leopold Winter, Brentford, Wharfingers. Feb 15 at 3 at the Inns of Court Hotel, Lincoln's-inn-fields. Moon, Lincoln's-inn-fields
 Wittichell, Samuel Brown, Hereford. Feb 16 at 2 at the Spread Eagle Hotel, Winterbotham, Stroud
 Wood, Arthur, Stoke-upon-Trent, Grocer. Feb 11 at 11.30 at offices of Tennant and Co, Cheapside, Hanley

SCHWEITZER'S COCOATINA,

Anti-Dyspeptic Cocoa or Chocolate Powder.

Guaranteed Pure Soluble Cocoa of the Finest Quality, with the excess of fat extracted.

The Faculty pronounce it "the most nutritious, perfectly digestible beverage for Breakfast, Luncheon, or Supper, and invaluable for Invalids and Children."

Highly commended by the entire Medical Press.

Being without sugar, spice, or other admixture, it suits all palates, keeps better in all climates, and is four times the strength of cocoas thickened yet WHOLEMED with starch, &c., and is REALITY CHEAPER than such Mixtures.

Made instantaneously with boiling water, a teaspoonful to a Breakfast Cup, costing less than a halfpenny.

COCOA-TINA A LA VANILLE is the most delicate, digestible, cheapest Vanilla Chocolate, and may be taken when richer chocolate is prohibited.

In tin packets at 1s. 6d., 3s., 6s. 6d., &c., by Chemists and Grocers. Charities on Special Terms by the Sole Proprietors, H. SCHWEITZER & CO., 10, Adam-street, London, W.C.

MR. G. H. JONES,

SURGEON DENTIST,

57, GREAT RUSSELL STREET, LONDON

(Immediately opposite the British Museum),

Supplies, by his absolutely Painless System of Dentistry, the Great Exhibition Prize Medal Teeth (London, Paris, New York, Berlin, Vienna, &c.). S. G. Hutchins, Esq., Surgeon-Dentist to the Queen, says:—"I am glad you have obtained Her Majesty's Royal Letters Patent to protect what I consider the perfection of painless dentistry." Professor Gardner, late of the Royal Polytechnic Institution, says:—"I have examined and tested your patented painless system of adjustment; it is quite perfect, and is the most successful application of scientific laws for securing actual wear and comfort yet introduced." (Consultation free daily, and terms to suit every one. Pamphlet, "Painless Dentistry," 11th Edition, gratis and post free.)

MORTGAGES effected on Freehold or Long Leasehold Securities. Solicitors having funds to invest, or requiring money on good finished property, are invited to send particulars to Messrs. STUART BARNES & SON, Surveyors, 78, King William-street, City, E.C.

A FRENCH ADVOCATE (from the Court of Appeals of Paris) can be Consulted on all French and Foreign Law Matters.—Apply by letters or personally, No. 4, Bloomsbury Mansions, Hart-street, Bloomsbury-square, W.C.

WANTED.—Conveyancing and Chancery Bill Clerk. Salary £100. Apply, between 1 and 2 o'clock, to NICHOLL, MAXWELL, & CO., 1, Howard-street, Strand.

SHORTHAND CLERK Wanted in a Solicitor's Office. State speed, particulars, and experience.—Address, Box 3, Post-office, Stockport.

M. R. MEADOWS, of Bond-count Chambers, Walbrook, London, Solicitor, Author of "Questions on Conveyancing and Real Property Law," continues to Read Privately with Articled Clerks preparing for the Intermediate, Final, and Honours Examinations.

TRISTRAM'S CONTENTIOUS PROBATE PRACTICE.

This day is published, in 1 vol., 8vo, 21s., cloth.

THE CONTENTIOUS PRACTICE OF THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE in respect of Grants of Probates and Administrations, with the Practice as to Motions and Summonses in Non-Contentious Business. By THOMAS HUTCHINSON TRISTRAM, D.C.L., Advocate of Doctors' Commons, of the Inner Temple.

London:

BUTTERWORTHS, 7, Fleet-street, Her Majesty's Law Publishers.

M. R. BANISTER FLETCHER'S valuable TEXT BOOKS, arranged in Tabulated form, and fully indexed for ready reference.

LIGHT and AIR, with methods of estimating Injuries, reports of most recent cases, &c. Twelve Diagrams. Crown 8vo, cloth, 6s., post-free.

ARBITRATIONS, with Appendix of Forms, and List of Schedules. Crown 8vo, cloth, 5s., post-free.

COMPENSATIONS, with Appendix, giving Forms of Precedents and Valuation Tables. Crown 8vo, 5s., post-free.

B. T. BATSFORD, 32, High Holborn, London, or of any Bookseller.

This Day, 18th Edition, crown 8vo, 6s. 6d. (postage 6d.).

EVERY MAN'S OWN LAWYER.—A Handy Book of the Principles of Law and Equity. By a BARRISTER. Revised to the end of last Session, comprising Summaries of the Employers' Liability Act, the Burial Law Amendment Act, the Malt Tax Repeal Act, the Ground Game Act, the Wild Birds Protection Act, &c.

"A complete epitome of the laws of this country, thoroughly intelligible to non-professional readers."—Bell's Life.

CROSBY LOCKWOOD & CO., 7, Stationer's Hall-court, London, E.C.

NEW HIGH-CLASS JOURNAL.

LAND, a Weekly Journal for all interested in LANDED and HOUSE PROPERTY, with "INDEX to the ESTATE EXCHANGE REGISTERS."

EVERY SATURDAY, price SIXPENCE.

Number 1 ready Feb. 12.

. Prospectuses of LAND post-free on application to the Publishers.

Printed and Published for the Proprietors by

CASSELL, PETER, GALPIN & CO., La Belle Sauvage-yard, E.C.

Advertisements for the FIRST NUMBER of LAND should reach the Publishers not later than Thursday, the 10th inst.

Fourth Edition (further revised and enlarged), price 5s., net.

HINTS ON ADVOCACY, including Examples of Sixteen Types of Witnesses, and the mode of Cross-examining them. By RICHARD HARRIS, Barrister-at-Law, of the Middle Temple and Midland Circuits.

LONDON: WATERLOW BROS. & LAYTON, 24, Birch-lane.

Now ready, price 9d.

THE LAW ALMANACK for 1881.—Containing New Stamp Duties and all Legal Changes to present time.

THOMAS SCOTT, Warwick-court, Holborn,

And all Law Stationers and Booksellers.

PRELIMINARY, INTERMEDIATE, FINAL (Pass and Honours) LAW EXAMINATION.

MR. ALBERT GIBSON'S Classes and Postal

Preparation for these Examinations continue throughout the year, except during one month in summer. Two Residential Pupils received. Terms on application to 33, Southampton-buildings, Chancery-lane, or to St. Mary Cray, Chislehurst.

[N.B.—At the Michaelmas Examination, 1880, out of 26 pupils sent up for the Final 22 passed, out of 17 sent up for the Intermediate 16 passed, and all 9 pupils sent up for the Preliminary passed. At seven out of the last eight Examinations Mr. Gibson's pupils have taken Honours; the successes including First, Second, Third, Fourth, and Fifth Prizes, besides many Certificates of Merit, Second and Third Class Honours. In last June 10th and in last November three pupils secured Honours.]

MESSRS. HARMAN & MATTHEWS' HOUSE
PROPERTY LIST for February is now ready, and may be had gratis by post, or on application at 35, Walbrook, E.C. Desirable properties of every class wanted for numerous buyers.

STIMSON'S LIST OF PROPERTIES for SALE
for February contains 1,000 investments, and can be had free. Particulars inserted without charge. It is the recognized medium for selling or purchasing property by private contract.—Mr. STIMSON, Auctioneer, Surveyor, and Valuer, 2, New Kent-road, S.E.

Auctions, Season 1881.

MESSRS. HARVEY, DAVIDS, & MORRIS,
beg to announce that they have arranged for their SALES by AUCTION to take place at the MART, Tokenhouse-yard, Bank, E.C., on the following dates throughout the ensuing year, commencing at TWO o'clock precisely each day:—

Date.	Floor.	Room.
Wednesday, February 9..	Ground ..	B.
Wednesday, March 2 ..	Ground ..	C.
Wednesday, March 16 ..	Ground ..	B.
Wednesday, March 30 ..	Ground ..	B.
Wednesday, April 20 ..	Ground ..	B.
Wednesday, April 27 ..	First ..	E.
Wednesday, May 11 ..	First ..	E.
Wednesday, May 25 ..	Ground ..	C.
Wednesday, June 8 ..	First ..	F.
Wednesday, June 22 ..	First ..	F.
Wednesday, July 6 ..	First ..	F.
Wednesday, July 20 ..	First ..	F.
Wednesday, August 3 ..	Ground ..	C.
Wednesday, August 10 ..	First ..	F.
Wednesday, October 26 ..	First ..	F.
Wednesday, November 23 ..	Ground ..	B.
Wednesday, December 7 ..	First ..	F.

These sales will include landed estates, town and country houses, ground-rents, reversions, and shares. Owners, solicitors, and trustees desirous of including properties, are respectfully requested to give instructions as early as possible, as it is of the utmost importance that sufficient time should be allowed to bring the sales prominently before the public.—Auction and Survey Offices, 117, Bishopsgate-street, E.C.

COURTS OF JUSTICE.

A fine Freehold Building Site, adjoining New-inn, close to the principal entrance to the High Courts of Justice, admirably adapted for the erection of a handsome pile of offices, and chambers for solicitors, barristers, and others, whose connections render proximity to the Law Courts a matter of importance. The property has an ample frontage, is but little hampered with ancient lights, and comprehends the grand superficial area of over 6,000 ft. It has been recently cleared of the structures which have hitherto cumbered the ground, and is now ripe for the display of architectural talent in the judicious disposition of a site almost unprecedented at this spot for the purposes to which its extent, position, and other advantages justify its application.

MESSRS. EDWIN FOX & BOUSFIELD will LET BY AUCTION, on a Building Lease, for a term of 80 years, with THE RIGHT TO PURCHASE THE FREEHOLD, on WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, at TWO o'clock precisely. Plans and particulars may be obtained of Messrs. De Jersey, Micklem, & Son, Solicitors, 19, Gresham-street, and of Messrs. Edwin Fox & Bousfield, 60, Gresham-street, Bank, E.C.

Valuable Freehold, Copyhold and Leasehold Estates.

MESSRS. C. C. & T. MOORE will SELL by AUCTION, at the MART, on THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, at ONE for TWO, the following PROPERTY:—

LIMEHOUSE, Poplar, and Stepney.—A six-roomed Copyhold House, 28, Samuel-street, Salmon's-lane; let at £19 10s. Two six-roomed Houses, 13 and 15, Southill-street, Kerby-street, Poplar; let at £24 4s. term 35 years; ground-rent £4 10s. Four Freehold Houses, 10, 11, and 12, York-road, near Stepney Station, and 1, Railway-place, adjoining, let at £75 8s. And the Business Premises and Dwelling House, in York-road, used as a wheelwright's; let at £30; term 70 years; ground-rent £3.—Vendors' Solicitors, Messrs. Hogan & Hughes, 23, Martin's-lane, E.C.

STRATFORD, Limehouse, and Poplar.—12 Houses, 2 to 24, Preston-road, Carpenter's-road, Stratford; let at £338; term 77 years ground-rent £14. Four Houses and Shops, 61 and 63, West India-road, and 4 and 6, Pennyfields, Poplar; let at £121 16s. term 151 years; ground-rent £21. 16 Houses, Nos. 1 to 16, Prince's-place, Nightingale-lane, Limehouse; let at £240 12s. term 42 years; ground-rent £70.—Vendors' Solicitors, G. S. Warrington, Esq., 1, Gresham-buildings, E.C.; and J. M. Barnard, Esq., 27, White Lion-street, Norton Folgate, E.

POPLAR.—3 Dwelling Houses, 6, 7, and 8, Cottage-street, High-street; let at £39; fine certain 30s.; quit-rent 6s. per annum.—Vendor's Solicitor, Beaton F. Taylor, Esq., 5, Gray's-inn-square, W.C.

SOUTH HACKNEY.—A 12-roomed Residence, with good gardens in front and in rear; No. 16, Lauriston-road, Broadway, in hand; annual value £29; term 60 years; ground-rent 47.—Vendor's Solicitors, Messrs. Barton & Son, 11, Queen Victoria-street, E.C.

STRATFORD.—Four 7-roomed Houses, with good gardens and forecourts, Nos. 28, 29, 30, and 31, Carpenter's-road; let at £114 8s.; term 51 years; ground-rent £3 10s. each.—Vendor's Solicitors, Messrs. Collier-Bristow & Co., 4 and 5, Bedford-row, W.C.

COMMERCIAL ROAD, E.—The desirable corner House and Shop, 130, Commercial-road; let at £50. Also adjoining Premises in Grove-street, with warehouse, loft over, and office, with separate entrance. Annual value £20; term 17 years; rental £45.—Vendor's Solicitor, George Turner, Esq., 75, Leadenhall-street, E.C.

Particulars of Vendors' Solicitors, as above, at the Mart; and at the Auctioneers' Offices, 144, Mile-end-road, E.

ROYAL INSURANCE COMPANY. FIRE—LIFE—ANNUITIES. ACCUMULATED FUNDS IN HAND OVER £4,000,000.

Agents wanted on liberal terms of commission.
Apply to J. HAMER OWENS, Manager, Law Courts Branch
33, Chancery-lane.

COMMERCIAL UNION ASSURANCE COMPANY. FIRE—LIFE—MARINE.

CHIEF OFFICES: 19 AND 20, CORNHILL, LONDON, E.C.
WEST END OFFICES: 49, FALL MALL, LONDON, S.W.

PROVIDENT LIFE OFFICE.

FOUNDED 1800.

50, REGENT STREET, and 14, CORNHILL, LONDON.

Existing Assurances exceed	£8,500,000
Invested Funds	2,124,711
Annual Income	279,552
Claims Paid exceed	6,500,000
Bonuses Declared..	2,342,000

During the past year (1880) each main item has shown improvement upon the preceding year.

	1870.	1880.
New Premiums ..	£15,172	£18,845
Income ..	273,684	279,552
Invested Funds..	2,077,215	2,124,711

CHARLES STEVENS, Secretary.

SUN FIRE OFFICE.

THREADEDEE STREET, E.C. CHANCERY CROSS, S.W.
OXFORD STREET (Corner of Vere-street), W.

ESTABLISHED 1710.

Homes and Foreign Insurances Effected,
Sum insured in 1879, £262,402,461.

FRANCIS B. RELTON, Secretary.

LAW UNION FIRE AND LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Chief Office—126, Chancery-lane, London, W.C.
The Funds in hand and Capital subscribed amount to upwards of £1,500,000 sterling.

Chairman—JAMES CUDDO, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, Goldsmith-

Deputy-Chairman—C. F. WHEATLEY, Esq. (Lee & Pemberton), Solicitor, 44, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

Every description of Fire and Life Insurance business transacted. Whole World and Unconditional Life Policies granted at a slightly increased rate of Premium.

Advances made on Mortgage of Life Interest and Reversions whether absolute or contingent.

Prospectus, Copies of the Accounts as deposited with the Board of Trade, and every information sent on application to

FRANK MCGEDDY, Actuary and Secretary.

ESTABLISHED 1851.

BIRKBECK BANK.—

Southampton Buildings, Chancery Lane.

Current Accounts opened according to the usual practice of other Bankers, and interest allowed on the minimum monthly balances when not drawn below £25. No commission charged for keeping Accounts.

The Bank also receives money on Deposit at Three per cent. interest, repayable on demand. The Bank undertakes for its Customers, free of charge, the custody of Deeds, Writings, and other Securities and Valuable; the collection of Bills of Exchange, Dividends, and Coupons; and the purchase and sale of Stocks and Shares. Letters of Credit and Circular Notes issued.

A Pamphlet, with full particulars, on application.

FRANCIS RAVENSCROFT, Manager

31st March, 1880.

LONDON GAZETTE (published by authority) and LONDON and COUNTRY ADVERTISEMENT OFFICE.

No. 117, CHANCERY LANE, FLEET STREET.

HENRY GREEN, Advertisement Agent, begs to direct the attention of the Legal Profession to the advantages of his long experience of upwards of thirty years, in the special insertion of all pro forma notices, &c., and hereby solicits their continued support.—N.B. One copy of advertisement only required, and the strictest care and promptitude assured. Official stamped forms for advertisement and file of "London Gazette" kept. By appointment.

EDEN AND SON

ROBE MAKERS



BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT.

To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench Corporation of London, &c.

SOLICITORS' AND REGISTRARS' GOWNS.

BARRISTERS' AND QUEEN'S COUNSEL'S DITTO.

CORPORATION ROBES UNIVERSITY & CLERGY GOWNS.

ESTABLISHED 1699.

94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.